NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

No. CCCCLXXVII.

AUGUST, 1896.

THE FUTURE OF THE ANGLO-SAXON RACE.

BY SIR WALTER BESANT.

THE future of the English-speaking peoples is a subject which at this present moment seems of more than ordinary importance, because there are signs of very serious dangers which threaten that future, of possibilities which may most disastrously affect the fortunes of the Anglo-Saxon race. What it is that is now in the possession of that race either to administer wisely or to throw away; what a magnificent heritage it has obtained either to develop or to ruin; what power and empire and authority and greatness unequalled in the history of mankind it may achieve or may destroy; what it actually has and holds in the present: these are the things to which I propose to direct the attention of my readers.

The ancestors of the Anglo-Saxon race came from a cold, sterile, and ungenial tract of country in the midst of which now stands the very noble city of Hamburg. They came over in hordes; they settled down on the English coasts; whole districts of their native land were deserted; they came in tribes and in families; wherever they sat down they brought with them, as part of themselves, not to be changed, their laws and their customs and their language. These survived, and remain to this day in essentials the language, the laws, the customs, of their country. Observe, then, the first obvious facts about

Copyright, 1896, by LLOYD BRYCE. All rights reserved.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

this people. In their own homes they become restless; they cannot remain quiet in their own settlements; they are impelled to change. They cross the water, carrying with them their language, their religion, their institutions. It is now acknowledged by all writers that they did not exterminate the Britons, who continued after the struggle was over to live among their conquerors. But the Saxons absorbed them: the conquerors took nothing from the Britons, whose religion (they were Christians), whose manners (they were highly civilized), whose laws (they were Roman), the Saxons trampled under foot. Not a vestige remains of the ancient British civilization. The masterful Anglo-Saxon would keep his own laws, his own customs, his own religion. When the Danes came the same thing happened. A few years after the struggle we find that the Danes are absorbed; everything is again English. When the Normans came the same thing is observed; after a few years everything is once more English. All that the Normans imposed was the Feudal system, out of which the English have been gradually struggling for eight hundred years. The point which I wish the reader to remember is that, wherever he goes, the Anglo-Saxon carries with him a great load of personal property—laws, religion, manners, customs, and language—which he will not exchange or part with. Wherever he goes he is not absorbed—he absorbs. He continues to do this in the present day just as of old he absorbed, one after the other, Briton, Dane, and Norman. In England we are still perpetually absorbing this stream of foreign immigration which never ceases—German, Norwegian, French, Italian. The United States of America in the same way cover ground which has been Spanish, French, Dutch, and Swedish. What trace can you find of the Spanish occupation?—an ancient town. What trace do you find of the Dutch?—a few houses here and there which remind one of Amsterdam. Anglo-Saxon America is constantly engaged in absorbing. Immigrants by thousands pour every year upon the American shores from all quarters of the globe. They land: they scatter over the country: in a few years, like those who are American born, they bear the stamp of the English law and speak the English language.

We are, then, as we always have been, a masterful race; we are a stiff-necked, unyielding race; a tenacious race; we are a race which cannot change its own mind—as regards laws and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

manners—for the mind of any other race; we are a people which if it settles down anywhere, means to go on living as before and to make other people live in the same way.

These are very marked and very important qualities. Had any one observed these qualities when the Saxon ships first wintered on the Isle of Thanet, he might have prophesied a great and solid future for this people; but no prophet at any time, I am convinced, would ever have prophesied a future so great, so solid, so glorious, as the race has achieved; while as to what lies before it, although the possibilities are so clear that a child could read them, we have been somehow afraid of speaking out.

In the next place observe another racial mark. The Anglo-Saxons have always, like their ancestors, been a restless people. To sit down in the same place cultivating the soil for generation after generation has always been impossible for them. From time to time they want change; they are always wanting change. During a thousand years and more they found that change in continual war. When one reads in history page after page of war—war—war—battle—victory—defeat—the slaughter of thousands, the towns given over to pillage, the burning farms, the starving children; when, as one reads the very letters grow blood-red, and the very sunshine grows blood red; and the very floor grows red with the blood of the killed and wounded, one must remember that the things which seem so terrible to us were not in the least terrible to them. They were only part of life. The people carried on war between themselves without ceasing; the King of Northumbria fought the King of Mercia; the King of Wessex carried war into the realm of the King of Kent; it was not because the Mercians hated the Northumbrians—it was because of the instinct for change; because the restlessness of the people made war necessary.

I maintain, therefore, that restlessness is as much a mark of the Anglo-Saxon as masterfulness and obstinacy. I think that the rebellions, the risings, the civil wars of English history were due more to restlessness in the blood than to loyalty to this cause or that. What was Wat Tyler's rebellion but an instinctive restless upheaval of the people? They listened to leaders who formulated grievances, and held out hopes of wonderful things; they rose all together seized by the strange contagion which sometimes

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

runs among people like wildfire; they rejoiced, those rude and ignorant peasants, in freedom from labor and the prospect of fighting and of plunder. It was a brief but glorious holiday that they enjoyed. Those who escaped and got safely home had much to think about and much to tell. But their restlessness was subdued for the time. It seems to us, considering history, most wonderful that so many men were always ready to flock after this or that standard. How could they be persuaded to risk their lives? Because they were restless; the village life was monotonous; the daily labor was wearisome. So, when the chance came, they seized a pike and marched with the column of shouting rustics—not in loyalty to the Red Rose or the White, but because they wanted a change.

There was another way in which they showed their restlessness. One cannot, unfortunately, be always fighting; there must be intervals, sometimes long intervals, of peace. What, then, was the poor man to do when his eyes turned with yearning beyond the blue hills, and when his cottage and his fields became loathsome to him; when, in short, the old restlessness got into his veins and he could no longer contain himself? He could go on pilgrimage. That was the safety valve. When the restless fit grew so strong that it could not be repressed, the man begged a license of the bishop and with staff in hand set off on his pilgrimage. The roads were black with the multitudes of those who trudged or rode on pilgrimage to our Lady of Walsingham or St. Thomas of Canterbury. We must remember the dulness of the country life, where nothing happened but the change of seasons. We must remember, also, the animation and business of the highway along which the pilgrims walked; the night spent in some monastic house, the gay and animated conversation of the company, the feasting and the music and the singing—what an exchange was that from the lonely cottage and the quiet farm!

The Anglo-Saxon race is thus, essentially and above all, a restless race. What has this restlessness done for the race in modern times? Look at America; look at India; look at South Africa; look at Australia; look at New Zealand. They are monuments—I hope lasting monuments—to the Anglo-Saxon restlessness. Consider the history of the sixteenth century when that restlessness sent out ships by the hundred for the exploration of the American coast, and the capture of the Spanish ships;

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

consider that of the next century when the American Colonies were founded; consider that of the last century when, with the help of the Colonists, the English turned out the French from America; and when, without any help, they turned them out of India. Consider the growth of English trade; the despatch of ships to every port in the world; the increase of English wealth by leaps and bounds even at a time when England was carrying on a death struggle in Continental war. What do all these things mean? Enterprise? Courage? Tenacity? Yes; all these things; and, what is more, the racial restlessness which cannot remain still or contented.

Every year there are carried away from the shores of Great Britain so many hundred thousand of our young men. They are the restless class: most of them have proved themselves totally unable to accept the conditions of modern life; they hate the desk; they hate books; they cannot pass examinations. For these young men, who in other respects are often the very flower of the flock, there are places where they can live without books. Formerly there were openings for them in the United States, in Australia, in New Zealand. Those openings seem to be closed; the stream of emigration turns in other directions. There is now, for instance, South Africa. Now, just exactly what England was formerly to the Angle or the Jute in the German court, so is such a new country as South Africa to his descendant of the present day—the land of enterprise, the land of wealth, the land of fighting, the land of possibilities. There are other places. British Columbia is not yet filled up; Canada, Western Australia, Tasmania, could support a tenfold present population. That is not, however, the question. I want to point out the continuity of history. Things repeat themselves because we are the descendants of our ancestors. The Frisian came over and settled in England fifteen hundred years ago; he made the place his own; he imposed his laws, his customs, his religion, and told the Britons to become absorbed or to disappear. It is discovered that our young brother does just exactly the same thing. He is in America; he is in Australia; he must move on; he must make for himself a new nest; he must fight for it if necessary. And when he has settled, he must rule; he will tolerate no master.

Now let us consider at the close of the nineteenth century what part of the world belongs to our race. We have the whole of North

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

America, an immense possession, glorious in the present, destined to become far more glorious in the future; we have the whole of Australia; the whole of India; the whole of New Zealand; we have rich and beautiful islands, such as Jamaica, Ceylon, Newfoundland, Mauritius, and hundreds of other islands; we have Burmah, Singapore, and the settlements of the far East; we have a vast extent of territory in Africa; we have strongholds in the Mediterranean; we occupy Egypt; the whole round world is dotted here and covered there with the possessions of the Anglo-Saxon race; all that is best, most temperate, most fertile, best fitted for the white man's permanent residence, is ours: if it were one United Federation of States it would be the greatest, the richest, the most powerful empire, republic or state that history has ever recorded.

The imagination cannot all at once take in the magnitude of the Anglo-Saxon possessions. We want help to assist us in understanding what our possessions really mean. Take the test of the language, for instance. If we add up all together the numbers of those who speak the European languages we should find that one-third of the whole number speak our language, while only one-eighth speak French, and only one-seventh speak German. For at this moment there are a hundred and twenty millions of people who speak English as their native tongue, without counting the Hindoos, who are fast acquiring it.

Take, again, the test of literature. Everybody now reads. Some, it is true, read only newspapers: most read books. There are free public libraries, which put all books worth reading into the hands of the people. Suppose that only one-half of the English-speaking race read books; that means that a popular work, a work which appeals to the heart or to the head of the great public, can command sixty millions of readers, and in the immediate future will command double, and, presently, treble that number. Never before, in the history of the whole world, has literature commanded so enormous an audience; never before has poet, dramatist, novelist, historian, preacher, had so magnificent a theatre, so crowded a house. We cannot realize such a theatre; we can only in imagination see a vast theatre filled with white faces, listening faces, faces that are played upon by passing sunshine and flying cloud, as the speaker moves their hearts. Perhaps we may imagine something of this vast audience, if we

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

remember that it used to be thought much if a book was read by two or three thousand, and now we can talk of a book being read by sixty million.

It surprises, again, one who considers this present position of our race not so much that we have spread over so vast an area, and have multiplied ourselves so enormously, but that this has been done with such wonderful rapidity. In the sixteenth century, when the English-speaking race was just beginning to feel its way across the Atlantic, it did not number more than five millions. A hundred years ago, when England began her long war with France, her own population was no more than fifteen millions, while in America there were about five millions—twenty millions in all. Again, a hundred years ago there were in the whole of Australia no more than a few thousand convicts and guards; in New Zealand, Tasmania, and South Africa there were none. In fifty years we have seen these countries assume a population as a man puts on a cloak. We look one moment; there is the solitude of the forest, the lapping of the river on its shores, the cry of the wild beast. In twenty years' time there is a great city in the midst of a crowded colony. Nor are these ephemeral cities; they have come to stay; they stand in the centres of real and lasting trade; they increase every year as the country to which they belong grows richer and more populous. In America the States which a hundred years ago were the far West, belonging to the fierce and untameable Red Indian, are now central States, while the far West is the coast of the Pacific, and the Red Indian has almost disappeared; the prairies are broken up into farms; the woods are disappearing before the axe of the settler, and the States which thirty years ago were wild lands are now filling up with towns and villages and cultivated farms.

I have spoken of a hundred years ago: one may say fifty years ago.

It was then that a mysterious restlessness seized all of us at the same time. English, Scotch, Irish, Welsh in thousands sailed to Australia, to New Zealand, to Canada; some of them flocked to the United States. The young men of the States moved westward with one consent. The Irish seem more than any to have felt the impulse, and they sent half their people across the seas. We used to say that the Irish exodus was the result of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

potato famine. That was one cause, but not the greatest: it was restlessness that fired the blood of a people who had lived too long in peace and quiet. It is now, as it always has been with our race; from time to time we want something to work off the instinctive restlessness. Travel, emigration, the struggle with savage races, the many little wars which are always stirring our blood—these things take the place of those which formerly quieted our restless souls.

Mere emigration, however, will not account for this vast increase of the English-speaking population. Besides, the increase has gone on in England as well: we who a hundred years ago were fifteen millions are now forty millions. The increase has been brought about partly by the invasion of the foreign element which the Anglo-Saxon has made haste to absorb. Look at shop windows as you walk about certain parts of London; the foreign names occur continually—here are French, Dutch, German, Italian, and Norwegian names. Inside every house you would find an Englishman bearing that name. It is exactly the same in New York. The Anglo-Saxon has absorbed that man; in the second generation he is pure English or American.

There remains, however, the remarkable fact that in a hundred years the English-speaking race has leaped up from twenty millions to a hundred and twenty millions, and has extended its possessions by something like a fifth part of the habitable globe. It would be impossible to find any other example in history of an increase so rapid, and an extension of territory so vast.

This, then, is the present position of our race: we possess the finest and most desirable parts of the earth; we are more wealthy than all the rest of the world put together; we are connected together by a common ancestry; by a common history up to a certain point; by the same laws which we have inherited from our common ancestors; by the same speech; by the same religion, not speaking of sects; by the same literature; by the same customs, with minute differences; and by millions of close ties of blood relationship, even those of brothers, sisters, parents, and children. It would be difficult to find stronger bonds: they are such as nothing in the world can cut asunder. No fighting between ourselves, not centuries of warfare, not rivers of blood, can destroy these bonds. Nations which are so connected may have their quarrels, their wars, intensified by kinship into civil wars;

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

but they cannot cut asunder these bonds, which bind them more tightly than any treaty, or alliance, or covenanted bond of union.

Yet, to speak of the present union of the English-speaking race is ridiculous. What, then, about our disunion? Well, we form, theoretically, one great empire and one great republic. In point of population the two sections of our race are equal; but one section is split up and divided into many parts; the other is an undivided whole, which adds very greatly to its strength. Again, one section, itself the union of many sovereign States, is bound together by a central government representative of all those States. And it has free trade between all those States. The other section has a central government, but it is not representative of other component parts; each of these parts—each of these sovereign states—has its own government, and is practically independent and sovereign, though it is called a colony; there is no free trade among these states; but each has a tariff of her own to suit the supposed wants of her people. In other words, the tie which binds Great Britain and Ireland to Canada is so slight as to be little more than a sentiment; so with Australia. England derives no revenue from the colonies; yet it is understood that in case of war she must defend these colonies out of her own resources. And slight as is the connection of Great Britain with one of these states, their connection with each other is slighter still: there is hardly even a touch of sentiment, as yet discovered, in the regard of Australia for Canada.

The position, therefore, is this. On the one hand, there are the United States, really, not nominally, united—a compact extent of territory, with a constitution which makes it very unlikely, very difficult, for any questions to arise which will endanger that union, with a population equal to one-half the whole of our numbers; on the other hand, we have a so-called empire consisting of the British islands and the practically sovereign states of Canada, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, and India, without speaking of the smaller and less important dependencies. The advantage, so far as to position and strength, would seem to be with America; at the same time this advantage is every year lessened, because population always increases faster in new than in old countries. If in fifty years' time the United States will have a hundred millions instead of sixty, Australia

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

will have twenty millions instead of four, South Africa ten millions instead of two, and so on. Let us remember that the continent of Australia will be able to support a population of two hundred millions, and that South Africa will support as many as are likely to demand its hospitality for a hundred years to come.

There are three things which separate states—difference of language, difference of religion, difference in form of government. With us there is no difference in language, nor is there, practically, any difference in religion. The vast majority of English-speaking people profess some form of the Protestant religion; those who do not, enjoy the most perfect freedom to follow their conscience. The third point, however, the difference in form of government, is serious.

I suppose that many have never realized the significance of the fact, or even the fact itself, that while all the states that have come out of Great Britain have had to create their own form of government, every one has become practically a republic. In every one of them exist all those institutions which are essentially republican—the recognition of every man's equal rights, the vote given to every man, representative government, no hereditary or privileged class, no established church, free education. The governor, who is the only officer sent out by the mother country, represents the President of the state, who is nominally the Queen of the colony; but as President he has very little power: all the power is in the hands of the people and their representatives. What does this mean? All these countries found themselves under the necessity of creating a form of government for themselves. Did they proceed to copy the form of the mother country? Not at all. Did they weigh the advantages against the disadvantages of monarchic or republican government? Not at all. Quietly, without any fuss or argument, without exciting any bad blood or party feeling, they proceeded, each state by itself, and without communication or conspiracy or mutual understanding, to create a new republic.

This is a very remarkable circumstance in the history of the English colonies: it is very significant that not one should have attempted to produce a copy of the British Constitution. Here, in England, we grow up contentedly with our King, Lords, Commons, and Church; many among us are prepared to defend our institutions *en bloc;* many more, who would not trouble to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

defend things as they are, regard them as institutions which it would be disastrous to change on account of the bad blood which revolution would cause; others feel that our own institutions are more comfortable than those of a republic, because they require less personal effort on the part of the individual; very few of us at the present moment are really and actively revolutionary; yet, when these people go away and make a new country for themselves, not one has ever proposed that their new constitution shall be copied from the old.

We have thus seen the beginnings, the development, and the present position of the Anglo-Saxon race. There are six great countries, of which two are fully grown, and four, viz., Canada, Australia, South Africa, and New Zealand, are practically only in their infancy. We are united by such bonds as I have mentioned; we are disunited, except for sentiment, only by differences in the form of government. As for the seas which roll between us, they are no longer an element of disunion; we are parted by two or three weeks; we pass over to each other without difficulty, almost without danger.

Let us now consider the possible future of our race. What will be the development of the British colonies, for instance, in the matter of government? Will they put off the republican, and assume the monarchical form? I cannot conceive such a change as even possible. I cannot understand that any republican, any man in whom personal equality is part of his very soul, not to be torn out except with his life, could ever desire the election of a king, whose very name means to him hereditary rule, hereditary privilege, hereditary superiority.

With every generation the republican ideas certainly become intensified; with every generation, then, these great colonies will become more and more separated from the mother country in feeling. There is one event, and only one, which would be able to convert a republic into a monarchy; that would be a life and death struggle, a disastrous war, a term of deep-seated national humiliation, when the country might take shelter under a dictator who might become emperor or king.

What, however, about England? Shall she change her forms in order to fall in line with the other Anglo-Saxon countries? In asking such a question I would not look for a reply to the books and papers and arguments of philosophers. We must

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

not ask what is philosophically considered best or fittest; we must go straight to the people themselves, and ascertain in which direction their thoughts are tending, whether in the direction of change or in the direction of conservatism. How are we to find out what they think? We must read the papers which they read; we must listen to the orators and preachers who have found a way to make them listen, and have touched their hearts. When I was a boy I was curious about journals and papers of all sorts. I used to buy, especially, certain papers designed for the working classes. My earliest recollection of politics is that the Queen, the Church, the House of Lords, the capitalists, and all employers of labor were every week attacked with a venom and a virulence which exceeded everything that we could now show. All these institutions were to be pulled down—the day after to-morrow. Now, although such papers as these were exceptional and extreme, the smoke showed the existence of fire; there was a great deal of loose, vague, fierce republicanism in the air; not only working-men, but sober, educated, thinking men were asking whether the time was not come for a republic. The question was not whether a republic is or is not a better form of government than a limited monarchy, but whether the time was come for a republic—which begged the other question, and practically assumed that a republic is the better form. Now I do not suppose that the number of philosophers who would like a republic on abstract principles is less than it was, but I am quite sure that the number of people generally who ardently desire such a change of government in Great Britain is far less in proportion to the population, while the scurrilous and blackguard papers have, so far as I know, entirely disappeared. I lay great stress on this point, because there is, if we come to think of it, this very remarkable relation of the press to the people that one cannot say whether the press leads the people or whether the people leads the press.

Returning to possible changes in England, I think it may be assumed as a matter of general experience that the duty of preserving our institutions, with such modifications as may be necessary from time to time, is at this moment a fixed conviction with the great majority of the English people. Loyalty to the Crown, which has been cultivated, so to speak, by the long reign of a blameless sovereign, is deeper

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and truer and established on stronger foundations than ever it has been before, even in the reign of Queen Elizabeth; the Church is no longer reviled and hated by the people; even those who would deprive the Church of her national character regard her with respect, and as regards the House of Lords we hear very little now about the foolishness of believing in hereditary wisdom. The form of government under which the English people live is so firmly established, it rests on such solid foundations of the will, consent, and deliberate choice of the people, that it will not be removed or changed till something happens to change this will and consent. Nor do I think that there will be in the great colonies any approach to English ideas in this respect.

The colonies could not, in fact, adopt the British constitution. The English form of limited sovereignty has grown up slowly and gradually; the people have forgotten the long struggle of centuries by which they did limit at last the power of the Sovereign; the memory of that struggle has departed; it seems as if the thing grew without any struggle; within the memory of living men there has been no revival of the old struggle; it seems a natural thing that the Sovereign should not be able to command anything except the affection and the respect of her people.

If, however, the English government remains what it is, and the English colonies become more and more obstinately republican, there will most certainly exist a permanent cleavage between them, growing every year wider and wider. That is true, and it is a danger which can only be met in one way, which I will presently explain.

Apart from the form of government, what line of change awaits our race in the immediate future? The colonies will drop off one after the other, and become independent. Australia, which could not, as yet, defend herself against Japan, must, as she grows stronger, become independent. We shall then—say in fifty years—see six great English-speaking nations; every one will be more populous than France at the present day; filled with people who have absorbed all foreign admixtures; governed by the same laws; inheriting all the Anglo-Saxon qualities, virtues, and weaknesses.

The people of these nations will be unlike each other in peculiarities, due to climate; those of tropical Queensland, for instance, will differ in certain respects from the inhabitants of To-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ronto or Quebec. But in mind and in manners they will be all alike.

What will happen in a world which possesses six great nations all united by such bonds as we have already described?

We stand already at the parting of the ways. By our actions, by our words, of this very time we may affect for good or for evil the whole future of our race.

There are two roads lying before us; two roads well marked —visible for many miles; one road as easy as the other. Which shall we take?

The one road leads through wars, which must be civil wars for ferocity, for massacres, for prolonged rage, for the bitterness which lasts for generations; for the evil example which leads to other wars; for the ruin and the waste and the destruction of all that the Anglo-Saxon race was sent into the world to achieve. Here is an imaginary page of history: "After the termination of the long and disastrous war between Great Britain and the United States, in which so many fleets were destroyed with practically all the trained sailors on both sides, and when both countries were exhausted, the Dominion of Canada declared war against the Australian Federation, and another sea war was commenced which lasted five years . . . " and so on. "Between one state and another there were commercial rivalries, protective and prohibitive tariffs; the bitterness of old quarrels; a constant readiness to rush into new quarrels; the Anglo-Saxon race, of which so much had once been expected and prophesied, fell during these centuries into a family at enmity with itself; always at war one with another," and so on. Is this kind of thing possible? It is more than possible; it is quite probable. When brothers begin to fight, they never cease fighting; they can never be reconciled; and each battle only makes the former hatred worse. Therefore, for these English-speaking nations we must make war impossible; and since at present four of these nations have not yet become independent, we must make war impossible between the two which represent them all. The late scare, from which we are not yet quite free, has shown us some of the dangers that lie in our way; one word more of arrogance or insolence from one side or the other, and we should have been plunged into such a war as would serve for an example for these younger nations; nay, they would themselves have been dragged

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

into the struggle, and so the seeds of hatred would have been sown in their hearts, too, to bear harvest in the years to come.

We must make it impossible for any war at any time to happen between these nations. How can we do this? It will not be sufficient to trust to the good sense, the moderation, the wisdom of leaders and ministers. All the wisdom in the world will not avail against personal ambition.

There is another danger. We talked at the outset of the restlessness of our race. This restlessness in modern life is generally cured by travel, by the struggle for wealth, by intellectual effort; but there is a great mass of the people who do not travel, are not engrossed in work, do not work with the brain. The danger of a simultaneous movement, an unanimous cry for war, such a rush as that of Wat Tyler' s men, is one ever present and much greater in a republic than in a monarchy. We must guard against the ambition of statesmen and against the madness of the people. For my own part I can see no way open to us except a Court of Arbitration, before which all cases of difference shall be brought. The mere existence of such a Board will prevent cases from arising, while the knowledge that there can never be war between the two nations will at once alter the tone of the press in every Anglo-Saxon country to that of permanent alliance.

Now suppose such a Board of Arbitration to be established. What do we see in the future? The six nations will be separate, yet united; each will be free to work out its own development in its own way; it will be impossible for them to quarrel; they will understand that free trade between themselves will be the best in their own interests; their press will be courteous, each to each; they will be rivals only in art, science, and literature. Above all, they will form a firm alliance, offensive and defensive, with such a navy that all the world united in arms would be powerless against them. And, as an example for all the world to see, there will be the great federation of our race, an immense federation, free, law-abiding, peaceful, yet ready to fight; tenacious of old customs; dwelling continually with the same ideas; keeping, as their ancestors from Friesland did before them, each family as the unit; every home the centre of the earth; every township of a dozen men the centre of the government.

WALTER BESANT.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

IS JAPANESE COMPETITION A MYTH?

BY THE HON. ROBERT P. PORTER.

WHAT is Japanese progress and Japanese competition? You hear the question asked on all sides since the war with China, and the answers take as wide a range as the accounts of eyewitnesses of the battles and sieges of the conflict itself. Some say there is nothing in Japanese competition; that it is but a new bogie of the American Protectionist, stuffed with straw on the Pacific Coast, and carried eastward to terrify the American artisan, and induce him to come into line for the Republican ticket next fall. There are others who say that this Japanese, or, rather Asiatic, competition scare has its origin in London; that it was set agoing there by the Manchester bimetallists, who believe the cotton mills of India, of China, and of Japan are going to rob England of 400,000,000 Asiatic customers for its cotton yarns and cotton cloth; that the object of the scare is to induce the British government to adopt a more liberal policy on the silver question, and thereby take away the protection which these silver-using countries practically have against the gold-standard countries of Europe.

There are yet others who, having no definite facts to guide them, have reserved all opinions on the subject until inquiry into existing facts can be made and the truth established. In the United States little attention has been given the question except by representatives of branches of business that have suddenly been confronted with a competition from Japan that has thrown all calculations to the winds and for the moment paralyzed prosperous industry. So far these incidents have been confined, as I shall show, to the textile trades and to some special manufactures, such as floor matting, hempen and jute rugs, umbrellas, matches, brushes, especially tooth-brushes, some lines of porcelain and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

earthenware, straw plaits and braids, paper of various kinds, and other miscellaneous articles. It is not so much the quantities of these articles exported to the United States that has given alarm, but the sudden manner in which the Japanese have, metaphorically speaking, thrown their hats into the American market, and challenged our labor and capital with goods which, for excellence and cheapness, seem for the moment to defy competition, even with the latest labor-saving appliances at hand.

Those who have any doubt as to the reality of Japanese competition should glance at the windows of our leading carpet and upholstery establishments. There they will find, during these summer months, large quantities and infinite variety of cool-looking mattings and blue and white cotton rugs from Japan. A reference to the advertising columns of newspapers in the leading cities shows that these goods have been the specialties of the season and have been sold in enormous quantities. During this same season, whole windows in our popular drygoods houses have been devoted to most attractive Japanese cotton crapes, in colors as delicate as rainbow hues, at ten and twelve cents per yard. The silk departments of the same stores exhibit a tempting array of their summer silks, or *habutai*, as it is called in Japan, at such phenomenally low prices that the American silk manufacturer is pushed out of the market. In the early days of missionary work, the good Mrs. Jellybys used to hem moral pocket handkerchiefs for the little heathen. To-day the heathen Japanese have turned the tables on the Christian nations and cornered the world's market for silk handkerchiefs, exporting within the last few years 100,000,000 of these useful articles. Look at that big pile of tooth-brushes in the window of the corner drug store. Sometimes they are sold for ten cents each, sometimes given away with a twenty-five cent box of toothpowder. These brushes are made in Japan. An Osaka firm offered me the product of their factories for $1.50 (gold) per gross. At this price some of our enterprising metropolitan newspapers will soon be offering a brand-new tooth-brush free with every copy of their morning journals. Five dollars gold will purchase a gross of hair-brushes, and I obtained samples of an infinite variety of nail-brushes and shaving-brushes at prices equally low. It may be urged that the quality of these cheap goods is poor. That is true, but the Japanese, while making at this price, are also

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

making at $8 gold per gross a superior grade of tooth-brush for which we pay forty and fifty cents apiece at a fashionable drug store.

But what of all this? Suppose we admit the facts, the articles mentioned are small, and the total not so very large when compared with our total importations from abroad. To be sure, the articles are comparatively unimportant, but they are staple. Matches are a small article, but last year Japan exported, mostly to China, nearly five million dollars' worth, and this year her export of this small article will probably exceed that figure. Their safety matches can be bought for fourteen silver dollars, or, say, $7.50 gold for 7,200 boxes. Can Sweden compete at this price? Can the United States? It is doubtful.

Viewed as a whole, the foreign trade of Japan is not inconsequential. An increase of $30,000,000 of commerce in 1895 over 1894 is no small item for a country like Japan. The total exports and imports, including bullion, reached $296,000,000 in silver in 1895, and will exceed those figures this year. That we may know the exact bearing of this increased trade on American manufactures and labor, I have prepared a table giving the increase in the export of certain commodities from Japan between 1885 and 1895. It may be studied with profit by those interested, for it tells the story just as it is, and when that is done, the reader may arrive at his own conclusion:

TOTAL COMMERCE OF JAPAN, 1885 AND 1895.

Total exports and imports, 1895	$296,000,000
" " " " 1885	77,300,000
Increase	$218,700,000

This would seem to be a fairly gratifying increase—about threefold.

In the following table I have endeavored to group some of the more striking individual increases in the export trade of Japan for the period under discussion:

	1885.	1895.
	Value in Silver Dollars.	
Export of textiles of all kinds	$511,990	$22,177,626
Raw silk	14,473,396	50,928,440
Grains and provisions	4,514,843	12,723,771
Metal goods	2,112,997	6,538,220
Drugs, including sulphur and camphor	1,089,513	3,078,357
Books and paper	150,032	488,358
Tea	6,854,120	8,879,242
Matches	60,565	4,672,861
Straw braids	(no record of any)	1,387,643
Matting	935	3,461,369
Umbrellas (European)	1,765	735,207
Porcelain curios and sundries	2,786,876	11,624,701

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Within the last few months I have visited the districts in Japan and inspected the industries reported in the above table. The increase in the exports of textiles, which was over forty-fold in ten years, is due to the fact that Japan is a nation of weavers. The returns of 1895 show over one million weavers. Women weave in Japan as women sew with us. It is no exaggeration to say that in nearly every house in rural Japan the spinning wheel and loom are kept going from morning till night. It is impossible to gauge the capacity of these people in this industry by the present production. In some of the silk districts, I found modern machinery and even regularly equipped mills, employing from five hundred to a thousand hands.. As a rule, the factories range from 40 to 120 hands, with the products of thousands of houses with single looms to draw from for the demand. In Fukui, the most important exporting district, the greater part of the weaving is done in the homes, though the establishment of finishing houses makes it possible for the weaver to secure a uniformity of finish that the old method precluded. The exports of all grades of silk goods from Japan will be largely increased in the next decade, and this fact has been recognized by the French, who propose to put a duty on Japanese *habutai*. Nor will the conflict be confined to *habutai* alone, for the Japanese are awake to the fact that France leads the world in the originality and beauty of her textile designs. They have in the Kyoto district reproduced her moire antique with success The splendid silk stuff they are making for furniture covering may be seen in the brilliant effects of the French renaissance.

The Japanese are making every preparation, by the formation of guilds and associations, to improve the quality and increase the uniformity of their goods. It is well to note in this connection that while Japan has stimulated its exports of the manufactured article, it has enormously increased the production and export of raw silk. This has been done by the introduction of new methods and a more scientific treatment of the silkworm and the filature. I visited in Japan filature establishments equal to any I saw in France ten years ago when investigating the silk industry of that country. In the Fukui district the first silk *habutai* was manufactured in 1888, an aggregation of about $50,000. Last year this district produced $6,076,220 worth, and the present year, I am told, the output will be still larger.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In the spinning of cotton and the manufacture of cotton cloth, a still more phenomenal progress is noted, though not shown in the above table. The export of cotton cloth from Japan probably does not exceed $5,000,000, but it supplies a large and increasing home demand. Last year the value of the silk and cotton cloth produced in Japan, including such important articles as kimono stuff and obi fabric, was $71,350,747. Cotton spinning in 1889 gave employment to only 5,394 women and 2,539 men. In 1895, over 30,000 women and 10,000 men were employed in mills that for equipment and output are equal to those of any country. The future *situs* of the cotton industry, at least to supply the Asiatic trade, is bound to be in China and Japan. England is doomed so far as this trade is concerned and nothing can save her—not even bimetallism, as some imagine. Cotton mills are going up rapidly, both in Osaka and Shanghai, and only actual experience for a period of years will demonstrate which of these locations is the better. My own judgment, after a close examination of every item in the cost of production, is Japan. In this contest for the cotton trade of Asia, the United States must supply more and more of the raw cotton. The improvement in the number of the yarn spun and in the quality of the cloth woven simply means a larger proportion of American cotton. Two new lines of Japanese steamships have been projected this year, and these ships are to run between the United States and Japan. While Osaka is the center of the cotton-yarn industry, the flourishing city of Nagoya is the center of cotton-cloth manufacture. Here I found several mills turning out a great variety of goods, mostly for home consumption. The export of $50,000,000 of cotton cloth to China and Korea will be no great achievment for Japan before the close of the century.

The district of Japan best worth studying from an industrial point of view is undoubtedly that around the Bay of Osaka, including the cities of Hyogo, Kyoto, and Osaka, and aggregating a population of 3,750,000. Here the mighty city growing up at the head of the Inland Seas can draw its supply of cheap labor. Within a hundred miles north and south, Osaka and the great commercial port of Kobe have a population of over 16,000,000, and within this radius may be found (excepting Tokyo and Yokohama) all the large cities of Japan. Cross the bay, only sixty miles away, and you have the island of Shikoku with 3,000,-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

000 more. Here is a tributary population greater than that around London, and compared with which New York and its environments seem a thinly settled district and Chicago an unsettled area. From this center of industrial energy, Japan has a splendid outlet through the Inland Seas, and can supply China, now open to commerce and manufactures, rapidly developing Korea and Formosa, which the Japanese are now civilizing, and when the great Siberian railroad is completed, Osaka can send its goods direct to London from Vladivostok by a water journey of a few days. Surely the possibilities of New Japan are full of hope and forecast future prosperity for the Empire.

Should Japan take up the manufacture of woolen and worsted goods as she has done cotton, her weavers could give Europe and America some surprises and dumfound those who claim there is nothing in Japanese competition. A constant supply of cheap wool from Australia makes it possible, while the samples of Japanese woolen and worsted cloth and dress goods which I examined while there indicate that in this branch of textiles the Japanese are as much at home as in silk and cotton. They are also doing good work in fine linens, though so far the quantities produced are small.

In the rug district of Sakaye and the matting district of Okayama, the schools are depopulated to find children for these industries. The wages of the tiny mites thus employed are as low as two sen, about equivalent to one cent, per day, and sometimes range as high as three cents. The pay for adults of both sexes in these districts and in all the textile trades rarely exceeds ten cents American money. For this sum a Japanese can live, from his point of view, quite comfortably. The export of these articles from Japan in 1893 was $2,115,330; 1894, $3,199,565; in 1895, $5,079,271. Both of these industries will quadruple before 1900. The sudden influx of the Japanese umbrella, something like 2,000,000 exported in 1894, has caused anxiety among umbrella makers in the United States, though at present most of the product goes to China. These are some of the facts that point to the importance of Japanese competition. There is no necessity for making it a political question, but there seems to me at least to be a great necessity for a full and proper understanding of the changes going on in both Japan and China by reason of the introduction of modern appliances into countries where labor is so cheap,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and the environments of labor and cost of living so different from those which we confront at home in the United States.

The object of this article is not to prove any theory, but to lay before the intelligent people of the country the facts in relation to this controversy, so that they may form their own judgment. The question of "pauper labor" does not enter here, because with the exception of the employment of children, which is wrong, and the fact that Japan has no factory laws, laborers of both sexes seem well fed, happy and content with their environments. While it is not claimed that the Japanese are really competitors of the United States, it is claimed that these facts indicate that they might prove serious competitors in certain branches of industry. There are enthusiasts, who, for the sake of a theory, seem ever ready to brush to one side the facts. For instance, our United States Minister to Japan, Hon. Edwin Dun, a resident of Tokyo for twenty-five years, hastens to assure the American public that this talk of Japanese competition is all moonshine. The new minister from Japan to this country, Hon. Hoshi Toru, immediately on his arrival, gives out similar information for consumption on this side the Pacific. Every person interested in swelling the exports from Japan to this country declares with equal vehemence that Japanese competition is a myth. There has also been of late a great deal of talk emanating from these same gentlemen about increasing American trade with Japan. What does it all amount to? Simply an enormous increase of Japanese trade with the United States. This tells the story:

IMPORTS FROM UNITED STATES TO JAPAN, 1895.

Kerosene oil	$3,039,254
Raw cotton	2,338,177
Hides and leather	787,300
Flour	406,000
Total	$6,570,731
Total imports	9,271,911
Deduct the staple imports from total	6,570,731
Our miscellaneous trade with Japan	$2,701,180
Against this we purchased of Japan last year	$53,991,625

The problem briefly stated in round figures is this: We buy of Japan about $54,000,000 worth of goods; Japan buys of us $9,000,000, mostly staples; Japan takes our fifty-four millions

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and buys $56,000,000 of England, and England, not to be outdone by Japan in generosity, buys about seven millions of that country. All this is sad, and discouraging and humiliating, I know, but it is true as the gospel. That it is true, would seem to me one reason why the people of the United States must look at the question of Japanese competition free from all sentimental considerations. In other words, we must protect our own industry and our own labor. The importer, who seems to "run the show" to suit himself, secures a slice of the cake coming and going. He is as ready to buy of England as to sell to the United States—for a consideration. The question of home production, the employment of labor, or wages paid is of no consequence to him. In full possession of a good thing, he would indeed be foolish to make much of it. So he and his friends drag the red herring over the trail, as it were, by talking of bicycle shops turning out "ten wiggly-wobbly looking wheels per month"; of lucifer match factories, manufacturing "unstrikable matches"; of a "handful of floor mats," a few "sample tooth-brushes" and "jute rugs"; and, when all else fails, they start the cry of "political boojums" for the Presidential year.

Meantime, as we have seen, Japanese foreign trade has leaped up to three hundred million dollars, and the Empire has become an element well worthy of consideration, both in Europe and America, in connection with industrial and commercial matters.

While the foreign importers of Yokohama or Kobe (principally Englishmen), who do four-fifths of the business for the Japanese producer, industriously spread the notion that Japanese competition and Japanese industrial progress are twin myths, or bogies of the politicians and labor leaders in the United States and of bimetallists in England, the esteemed Japanese at home, with the seriousness which characterizes the race, indulge in very different reflections in relation to their progress. When in Japan I had the pleasure of meeting, among other statesmen and officials, Mr. Kaneko, Vice-Minister of Agriculture and Commerce. I found him a man of intelligence and foresight, and of wide experience in economical and statistical matters. Educated in one of the great European universities, he is up to the spirit of the age in all that relates to Japan and her industrial and commercial future. I am indebted to Mr. Kaneko's department for

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

many valuable reports. Any utterances of his should carry special weight. During the last two weeks of my stay in Japan Mr. Kaneko was engaged in a personal inspection of the manufactures and industries of Japan. He visited the same districts I visited during my stay there. In a speech addressed to a meeting of representatives of Chambers of Commerce throughout the Empire, held in May in Hakata, Fukuoka, Mr. Kaneko said:

"Japan is possessed of qualifications admirably fitted for making her a country of manufactures. Her population is comparatively large and labor is cheap.

"The Japanese are gifted with powerful eyes, hands and brains, and the Americans are terror-stricken at this.

"The cotton spinners of Manchester are known to have said that while the Anglo-Saxons had passed through three generations before they became clever and apt hands for the spinning of cotton, the Japanese have acquired the necessary skill in this industry in ten years' time, and have now advanced to a stage where they surpass the Manchester people in skill.

"The Japanese are unrivalled in the world for cleverness, and their future is truly awe-inspiring to contemplate."

"Furthermore," added Mr. Kaneko, "the position of Japan is very convenient for the purpose of importing raw cotton from China and India and wool and other raw materials from Australia. This country is naturally adapted to manufactures, and a wonderful advancement has been made in late years in respect to cotton spinning, weaving, and paper manufacturing. We have also begun to make excellent blankets.

"On account of Japan being a volcanic country, good sulphuric acid can be procured, the acid imported from China and India having been totally supplanted by the home product in the local markets.

"Englishmen have felt considerable uneasiness on seeing the prosperous state of business at Kawaguchi, Osaka. This is not my own personal opinion, but I have actually heard so from foreigners who have visited Japan for the purpose of inspecting trade. A commissioner recently sent out by merchants and manufacturers of Manchester was astonished at the development of the industries of Japan. On one occasion this gentleman visited the Department of Agriculture and Commerce, and remarked that he did not expect this country to be so abundant in raw materials. He was surprised at the skill shown in weaving, and saw excellent blankets being made at Omori from old rags.

"If the Japanese are so clever in utilizing useless materials for manufacturing useful articles, foreigners will be at a loss what to do in competing with the Japanese when the island is thrown open to them."

This will be done before the end of the present century.

To sustain the Vice-Minister of Agriculture, I quote from a recently published report of the Japanese Consul at Montreal, Mr. T. Nosse:

"Now, returning to the subject we have started with, viz., the articles we can supply the foreign market, I may repeat that it is a grievous mis-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

take to suppose that Japan can offer nothing but fancy goods, at fancy prices. Yes, sir, it is a great mistake, for we are now out in the world's market for staple goods. Take, for instance, our silk handkerchiefs. They used to be bought and sold just for the sake of their oddity, or of the fancy embroideries on them; but now they are used and admired for their cheapness, durability, and comfort above all, which cannot be approached by any other material.

"And then our silk piece goods—they were at first exported only for fancy purposes, but now they bid fair with European products as staple dress goods. I have been through some of the great establishments in this city, and what I have seen in these places is evidence to prove that ours can compete with the French goods, both in design, price, and popularity. Jute and rug carpets there on exhibition are no fancy goods at fancy prices, but are just the sort of useful homestead articles to remain in public favor always."

When Mr. Kaneko tells his friends of the United Chamber of Commerce at Hakata that "the Americans are terror-stricken," I have no doubt he had some of the facts I have presented in mind. An increase in this period of over forty-fold in the exports of textile goods I must confess is rather disturbing, especially to our silk industry, now partially protected by an *ad valorem* instead of specific duty. When Mr. Kaneko modestly attributes to an Englishman the statement that the Japanese spinners and weavers surpass those of Manchester, he simply gives utterance to an indisputable truth. When he furthermore says, "The Japanese are unrivalled in the world for cleverness and their future is truly awe-inspiring to contemplate," he undoubtedly has in mind the figures presented above from his own department, showing that ten years ago the value of the exports of matches was about $60,000, whereas this year they will reach a value of $5,000,000; that the sum of $935 in 1885 would have bought all the floor matting sent from Japan, while last year the exports aggregated $3,461,369; that last year 2,000,000 European umbrellas were sent into the world's markets, valued at about $750,000, against $1,765 worth in 1885; that Sakaye cotton and hemp rugs are making similar headway. Perhaps Mr. Kaneko may be a little impetuous in his expressions, but he is nearer the truth than those who make a business of belittling this remarkable industrial progress and deriding Japanese competition.

Nor does the case of Japanese industrial progress rest on any one's opinion. It is best studied by a glance at the facts. The following figures, which are from official sources, show that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Japanese commerce and industrial enterprise were greatly developed after the war. Here we have it:

(1) RAILWAYS.

	No. of Companies.	Capital, Silver Dollars.
Railroad companies having permission of Government to build	80	$141,953,000
Railroad companies projected	125	202,006,000
	205	$343,959,000
Electric and horse cars	34	20,249,000
	239	$364,208,000

(2) BANKS.

	No. of Banks.	Capital.
Increased funds	46	$18,435,000
Newly established	132	89,560,000
	178	$107,995,000

(3) INDUSTRY.

	No. of Establishments.	Capital.
Cotton mills	49	$29,582,000
Silk mills	24	10,295,000
Weaving factories	19	9,425,000
Mining and metallurgical companies	22	8,185,000
Electric works	15	11,620,000
Other industrial works	58	17,489,000
	187	$86,596,000

(4) COMMERCE.

	No. of Companies.	Capital.
Insurance works	14	$22,600,000
Exchanges	26	6,240,000
Trades	11	8,376,000
Navigation and ship-building	28	14,275,000
Other commercial enterprises	47	12,156,000
	126	$63,647,000
Total	730	$622,446,000

There are other signs of commercial and industrial progress, but the above is condensed and striking. The large cities of Japan I found filled with industrial energy, while in the country districts through which I traveled the click of the shuttle and the whir of the spinning wheel may be heard in almost every cottage. Manufacturing seems to run right along the lines of agriculture. The mulberry tree, the silkworm, the filature, the spun thread, the woven cloth, the dyeing and the finishing of *habutai*, handkerchiefs, and crapes are not infrequently combined in one establishment. The background of real handicraft, with labor so cheap and so industrious as in Japan, carried on in the country districts, will be hard to beat, especially when aided by the latest modern machinery.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Japan has an industrial army that has gone into the conflict of nations with whatever implement it had at hand. It has not waited until every man was equipped with the latest modern appliances, but has begun making excellent articles with the tools within its reach. In Osaka, it is no exaggeration to say, I saw the methods of a thousand years ago, side by side with the latest and most ingenious labor-saving devices. The quotations from the Rice Exchange were being waved by flags from peak to peak, within a stone's throw of the Post Office Building, where could be heard the click of the telegraph instruments, and the "hello" of the telephone girl in her *kimono*. In the magnificently equipped cotton-spinning and weaving factories, in paper mills, in some of the large silk factories, in the clock and watch factories, in the machine shops of Japan, I have seen the most modern English, German, and American machinery, and forces of men and women as thoroughly organized and as fully equipped as any on earth.

On the other hand, within the shadow of these immense establishments in the Osaka district, where tall chimneys remind one of Manchester, Philadelphia, and Chicago, thousands of human beings labor with tools so crude and implements so antique that you are taken back to the cities of the ancient world.

These tremendous contrasts, to my mind, show the courage of the Japanese. He simply throws away the old device when he can secure the new. Like all good workmen, however, he does not stand idly by waiting for the better implements. He pounds away at his rice, runs off beautiful silken threads from the ancient spinning wheel, plies the hand dextrously at all occupations, as he did a thousand years ago, wholly oblivious of the hum and rattle of the modern machinery in the surrounding factories. He cannot afford to stop, but he is none the less awaiting his turn to secure the newer machine. When Japan is fully equipped with the latest machinery, it will, in my opinion, be the most potent industrial force in the markets of the world.

ROBERT P. PORTER.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE CANADIAN ELECTIONS AND THEIR RESULT.

BY J. W. RUSSELL.

THE recent Liberal victory in Canada resembles the overthrow of an established order rather than one of those periodical changes which we look for in the ordinary working of party government. From September 17, 1878, until June 23 last the Conservative party ruled the Dominion. At no time in that period, except during the past year, had there been an opposition strong enough to prevent the Conservative leaders from imposing their policy upon an obedient majority in the House of Commons. During a part of their eighteen years' lease of power a partial acquiescence in the protective system, which had given political control into the hands of the Conservatives, had begun to spread even among the ranks of their opponents. In the general election of 1887 the Liberal leader promised that the protective tariff, the so-called "National Policy," would not be interfered with in the event of his success; and ever since then some concession more or less necessary has been made to the cry of alarm raised against a too sudden disturbance of protection. Questions of emotional patriotism, radiating from the feeling of attachment to the mother country, had been dexterously interwoven in the web of beliefs and practices which had secured Conservative success; and, rightly or wrongly, these questions had on more than one occasion exerted a decisive influence in the exigencies of party struggle.

The causes which led to the defeat of the Conservatives, as well as the change of Canadian policy resulting from it, are eminently worthy of notice. Standing midway, as Canada does, between the democratic federalism of the Republic and the limited monarchy of Great Britain, interest must increase in the contemplation of her commercial, industrial, and political aims.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Americans cannot be indifferent to the growth of an English-speaking power on their northern border, though, in recent years, they may have viewed its progress with mixed feelings, whose dominant tinge has been imparted by the attitude of Canadian Toryism. This election opens up to them a possible change of view.

The two main issues of the contest—tariff reform and the Manitoba school question—have for some time received a considerable share of public attention. They touched essential factors in the young life of the Dominion, and had compelled discussion of a strenuous and exciting character. The vigor or languishment of national industry, freedom or bondage in the expression of electoral opinion, the letter of the Constitution against its spirit—these were the broadly opposed meanings which the campaign presented to the Liberals; on the other hand, the Conservatives stood for the maintenance of protection, opposed any change supposed to involve commercial dependence upon the United States with its corollary of political dependence, and advocated the coercion of Manitoba in restoring the system of separate schools which had been abolished by that province in 1890.

In 1878 a Liberal Government, under the premiership of the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie, was defeated on the protective issue, and a tariff averaging thirty-five per cent. on dutiable imports displaced a revenue tariff of seventeen and a half per cent. The fiat had gone forth that Canada was no longer to be flooded with the manufactures of the United States, and a nation industrially independent was to be reared on the basis of protection. The new order of affairs started auspiciously, and for a few years seemed to justify itself. At the same time, the expenditure of large sums of borrowed money on great public works, the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and the land speculations resulting therefrom, added a fictitious volume of prosperity with which protection was exclusively credited. New lines of manufacture sprang up, and the enthusiasm of a people which had apparently found industrial deliverance supported the political party which had wrought all this good. As business prospered, the opposition to the new tariff seemed increasingly futile.

Between 1887 and 1891 the Liberals changed their policy to "unrestricted reciprocity" or "commercial union" with the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

United States, on the ground that free access to the markets of the United States was more desirable than all other commercial advantages. This policy gained many adherents, but was checked and discredited by its alleged political consequences. It seemed possible of realization only by the making of a common protective tariff between Canada and the United States as against the rest of the world. This accomplished, what would inevitably follow? Commercial union, it was claimed, could only be a prelude to political absorption; and the mere thought of such a result was enough to change the storm centre from tariffs to treason, from the discussion of economic issues to the problem of national existence. Suggestive inferences were drawn from the German Zollverein, which paved the way for the German Empire. Discrimination against Great Britain was charged, and truthfully, against the proposed change; and at the general elections of 1891 it was decisively rejected. The Liberals then returned to their former advocacy of a revenue tariff.

In the meantime, a day of reckoning had come in the application of a test whose validity could not be gainsaid, and which comprehended all minor issues of fact and policy. The census of 1891 showed a dishearteningly small increase of population, the whole Dominion having added but 508,000 to its inhabitants during the decade of 1881-91—a smaller increase than that of the single State of Minnesota during the same period. This revelation was conclusive, and the Conservative party irreparably injured by it. It was vain to argue in support of a system under which more than 1,000,000 Canadians, native and foreign-born, had been expatriated to the United States; and no explanations or comparisons could reconcile the facts with any hope of success. There were, indeed, subordinate proofs of failure. The coal and iron industries had remained practically stationary; the richest mineral deposits were undeveloped; the shipping interest, formerly so prosperous, had declined nearly a half in twelve years; and many industries which had started well had been wiped out by competition in a narrow market. But it seemed unnecessary to give subsidiary proof when the census had given the final and conclusive one. The recently won Liberal success, in so far as it related to the tariff question, naturally followed from the publication of the census returns, and from the business depression which has since continued. The people had given the national

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

policy a long and fair trial, and nothing could hide or palliate its failure.

Whatever may be said as to the relative importance of the two issues, there is no doubt as to which more deeply excited public feeling. The Manitoba school question strongly stirred the fires of racial and religious prejudice. The French and English-speaking elements of Canadian nationality confront each other in proportions naturally conducive to a powerful rivalry, heightened by traditions of hereditary enmity; and it has taken expert political management and the growth of mutual toleration to gain the comparative harmony which has thus far prevailed. The French Canadians are, politically, loyal to Great Britain and to the federal pact under which they live; but they are also passionately devoted to their racial development and their religion. The Pope has nowhere more faithful spiritual subjects; they have been called the most Catholic community in the world. The school question imposed upon them a severe test—a course of action in which religious subserviency and civic duty contended for the mastery. The legal and technical details of that question are of little interest to American readers, and with its salient points they are already familiar. The upshot of the long struggle in the courts was a decision of the Imperial Privy Council, which in effect, did not finally decide, but referred the question back to the Dominion Government with the result of its introduction as an issue in federal politics. Manitoba was ordered to restore the separate schools, and replied in a vigorous refusal; the Government tried to pass a remedial bill and failed, after which it appealed to the country to endorse its policy of coercion. In doing so its chief reliance was upon the Catholic hierarchy; and the well-known mandate of the Quebec bishops, commanding all the faithful in that province to support the government, was deemed a weapon of such strength and edge as nothing could resist. This unwise course occasioned the greatest surprise of the election, and forty-seven members of the House of Commons, out of a total of sixty-five in Quebec, were returned in direct opposition to their spiritual guides and in support of their eloquent fellow-countryman, the Hon. Wilfrid Laurier, the Liberal leader. This unexpected revolt has given new hope and meaning to the national life and progress. Hitherto considered the least enlightened and independent portion of the Dominion, Quebec has

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"stamped her strong foot and said she would be free," and has given a memorable rebuke to arrogant clericalism. The distinct functions of church and state have been splendidly emphasized just when and where the lesson was most needed; and the vexatious question of priestly interference in politics, which has had a continuous existence in Canada since confederation, will never again exert its former power of disturbance. The school question in all probability will, as a result of the election, be removed from the federal arena and referred to the Manitoba government, which has promised to deal generously in the matter. Mr. Laurier has promised the appointment of a commission of investigation, whose duty will be an impartial consideration of the educational condition of the Catholic minority; and all possible remedial action which can be taken in its favor without actually compromising the public-school system—which is deeply rooted in the affections of the people—will doubtless meet with the approval of the provincial authorities.

The new Liberal administration will naturally turn its first attention to the tariff. It was quite evident from the character of some journalistic comments, and more especially from certain recent Washington despatches, that the Liberal policy in this respect has been partially misunderstood. The fault lies chiefly with the Canadian Conservative press, which has repeatedly impugned the loyalty of the Liberals and represented their tariff principles as the cover of annexationist designs. This was false; the annexationist propaganda never had any considerable number of friends in either party, and such as it had were about equally drawn from both. But the repetition of the falsehood has produced an impression that the Liberals are as excessively friendly as the Conservatives were unduly hostile to the Republic. No one who knows Canadian sentiment can doubt that both parties are firmly attached to British connection, and that any weakening of that attachment is not in the thought of any-man of political prominence in the Dominion. It is true that the party now in power have been more genuinely anxious than their opponents for a measure of reciprocity with the United States, but they were never prepared to go unpatriotic lengths in the obtaining of it. Rightly or wrongly, they never admitted, as a party, the annexationist trend of their former political platform; still less could any possible change of political allegiance be involved in their

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

present one. They have promised to make no tariff amendments without due notice to the interests affected, and a careful inquiry and deliberation will precede any legislative changes, which will chiefly be the lowering of duties upon the raw material of manufactures. As nearly as can be inferred from the utterances of responsible men and leading journals before the election, the new tariff will average about twenty per cent. upon dutiable imports.

It cannot be denied that in recent years, and especially during the past year, the political outlook of the Dominion has been affected by the growth of the imperial sentiment. Twenty or twenty-five years ago any scheme of federation founded thereon would not have been seriously received by the Canadian people: it was utterly beyond the range of practical politics. The views of the Manchester school were then strong in England, and were accepted as the proper interpretation of colonial destiny. All this has been changed, and during the past year or two Canadian politics has seen the final effacement of ideas which conflict with British connection. The Venezuela embroglio, the South African question, and the progress of Australian federation have strongly reinforced imperial feeling, which hopes for a permanent organization of the Empire on a federal basis. Opponents of the idea have ridiculed the lack of its embodiment in any definite plan, but are compelled to admit the vigor of the sentiment behind it; nor are they disposed to belittle the essential foundation which such sentiment supplies.

A political ideal cherished by Great Britain and her self-governing colonies will, in the case of a people whose genius rules in practical politics, find some way of realization. The first step has already been taken by means of a series of conferences, representing different parts of the Empire, and designed to investigate the conditions under which commerce between them may be more largely developed. Such was the aim of the well-known Colonial Conference, held in Ottawa two years ago; also the conference of Chambers of Commerce held in London during June last; and without doubt future meetings of representative commercial interests will continue these investigations with the object of initiating practical results on this line.

Preferential trade is naturally associated with the new departure; and the attitude of the Dominion, as the largest of the self-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

governing colonies, will be influential in determining its progress or its retrogression. The policy of the Liberal administration harmonizes, partially at least, with the conditions which would be imposed from the British point of view. Mr. Chamberlain, in a recent speech before the Canadian Club in London, declared the indispensable prerequisite of a preferential tariff to be freer trade between the different members of the Empire, involving the abolition of protection by such of the colonies as had adopted it; and the first step in consonance with that declaration has just been taken by the Dominion, whose present tariff against British goods will certainly be lowered in the near future. Whatever reception the British masses may give to the preferential idea, it may be said that neither political party in Canada has taken decided ground for or against it. Sir Charles Tupper strongly favors it, and Mr. Laurier, judging from some of his speeches, does not see any insuperable objection to it. From the rank and file of their respective followers no general expression of opinion can as yet be expected, as the discussion of the question has only begun.

In Canada there is a wide-spread feeling of relief as a result of the election, and renewed hope of quickened progress in the near future. Pressing matters of domestic policy will be vigorously grappled with by the new government. The settlement of the great Northwest, which has been long retarded by railway monopoly and a bad land policy, will receive all possible attention and encouragement. The recent discovery of incomparably rich gold deposits in British Columbia, and the vast quantities of nickel ore in Ontario, offer a lucrative field to the capitalist; and the general mineral resources of the country will, it is believed, gain an impetus from the change of industrial policy. Increased wealth and population are the core of Canada's most exigent needs; the framework of government and institutions is strong, but has for some time comparatively lacked the vitalizing movement of business enterprise. Protection, having been tried and found wanting, will gradually but surely be eliminated from the list of contentious questions. Other matters, whose importance has been quite overshadowed by the two main issues, will likely engage the attention of the government; such as improved and enlarged canals, perfecting water communication between the head of Lake Superior and the Atlantic seaboard, a new fast ocean

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mail service, and the relation of Newfoundland to confederation. This is by no means a complete enumeration of the problems of progress which press for solution at a time of urgency, but also a time of hope.

Among the planks of the Republican platform formulated a few weeks ago at St. Louis, was one expressing the hope that Europe would withdraw from the affairs of this continent, and that the British people of its northern half would, by their own consent, become incorporated with the Republic. This expression of good will to Canada is genuinely appreciated; but the invitation is not likely to be accepted. It is gratifying, however, to know that the language of courtesy and friendliness is officially adopted by a great political party; and it will tend to make less noticeable any fugitive expressions, containing veiled threats, and uttered by irresponsible politicians. In this connection may be mentioned a resolution passed by the Dominion House of Commons shortly after the first echoes of the Venezuela affair had died away. It contained a strong profession of loyalty to Great Britain, but coupled with it a declaration of friendliness towards the United States. Among English-speaking nations, the exchange of such expressions may surely be said to spring from something deeper than the formalism of diplomacy.

J. W. RUSSELL.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WILD TRAITS IN TAME ANIMALS.

VI.—DOGS AND CATS.

BY DR. LOUIS ROBINSON.

WE now come to the domestic animals which are the immediate sharers of our homes, and I hope to show that we have quite as much to learn from the habits of the cat and the dog as from those of the creatures which we have already discussed.

The dog, in his every action, tells us that his forefathers lived in communities banded together for self-protection and for procuring food. The cat's habits show it to have been a solitary prowler from the earliest times. The one is an instinctive socialist; the other is an individualist, pure and simple. Just as the horse yields readily to the will of man because the young animals of every wild mob were submissive to their natural leaders, so the dog is ready to obey the authority of his superiors in the new "pack" in which he finds himself.

I have endeavored to show, in an article on "Canine Manners and Morals," published in another periodical, that the dog regards his master as the chief of his pack, and the other members of the household as his comrades. His very teachableness and intelligence owe their primary origin to the fact that game had to be secured by co-operation of the most elaborate kind. The wild *canidæ*, and especially those which were among the ancestors of the domestic dogs, often prey upon animals larger than themselves, and therefore, intelligent concerted action was an absolute necessity of existence, for a single wolf could not pull down a buffalo or a moose.

Cats, on the contrary, prey as a rule, upon creatures smaller and weaker than themselves; and, from the fact that they stalk their victims silently, they do not find it profit-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

able to band together. Being naturally solitary and independent, they do not, when captured, become members of the family in the same way that dogs do, but seem to regard the human inhabitants of the house rather as a part of the furniture than as comrades.

If we carefully consider what kind of raw materials for an opinion about mankind the wild cat brought into captivity, we find that they were of an utterly different nature from those possessed by the dog. The dog was constantly in company of his fellows, and so when he became associated with man he transferred his loyalty and many other mental habits and sentiments to the new government, just as a retired soldier carries his habit of prompt obedience into civil service. To put the case in a nutshell, the dog's master is regarded as the "boss" of the pack. This way of treating new things as part and parcel of what is old and familiar is common enough. When some South Sea Islanders first saw a horse they exclaimed, "What a very large pig"; and, doubtless, when Boston was first named, many who entered it thought more of the little town on the Lincolnshire coast than of the new city.

But the cat was a solitary roamer, whose companions were the trees of its native forests. It found a home in the hollow trunks and safety among the branches. How do we know that the cat's ancestors were dwellers in the forest? Because every kitten takes to a tree as readily as a duck to water. Also because nearly all forest dwellers are mottled in color, so that they may not be conspicuous among the light and shadows beneath the trees. While I was considering what was the probable view held by cats about human beings, it was suggested by one ingenious friend that probably they regard a man as a kind of locomotive tree, pleasant to rub against, the lower limbs of which afford a comfortable seat, and from whose upper branches occasionally drop tit-bits of mutton and other luscious fruits. We may laugh at the theory, but it has quite a respectable string of facts behind it to back it up. If the Kanakas argued from the pig to the horse, why should the cat not pass from the familiar tree to the unfamiliar organism called man?

At no time can you better contrast the habits of the dog and the cat than when they are feeding. A dog will either bolt his morsel whole as soon as it is given him or else run away to some

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

quiet spot where he can devour it at his leisure. He always acts as if he were in fear lest his treasure should be snatched from him; and when he is gnawing a bone, he will not allow even his master to approach without showing displeasure. In the wild state a struggle for the best of the spoil took place directly an animal was captured; and, as I have already said, your dog pays you the compliment of regarding you as a member of his pack. Hence, he thinks it probable that you would like to take the bone from him and gnaw it yourself.

As you have doubtless often observed, the cat acts in a very different manner. When a piece of food is offered to her she first carefully smells it, then takes it in a deliberate and gingerly way and sits down to eat it at her leisure. There is none of that hasty stowing the morsel into the one place where no dishonest rival can get at it, which we observe in the dog. It is plain that the cat is accustomed to take its meals in undisturbed solitude. Its master or mistress is not regarded as a possible rival. If the dog's hunting motto is "the more the merrier," the cat's is "the fewer the better fare." When you have to make a dinner off a mouse or a sparrow, the less company there is the better. It is easy to see that a cat's teeth and claws are not adapted for attacking large and powerful prey. Even that ridiculous and effeminate parasite, the fashionable pug, could make a better show in attacking a sheep or an ox than a cat.

It is often remarked that cats are more attached to places than to persons, whereas a dog will accompany his master and make himself at home anywhere. We see in these distinctive traits of character the remnants of certain wild habits. Naturalists tell us that wild cats nearly always choose some fixed spot as their permanent headquarters and devote their attention to the game in the immediate district. Packs of wild animals of the dog tribe, such as wolves, jackals, and dholes, on the contrary, range a great extent of country and make their lair at any convenient spot. Each is at home as long as he is with his fellows. Of course, when a swift creature, such as a deer or antelope, is run down, the chase would often end many miles away from the starting point. The weary and gorged pack would naturally lie down to sleep on the nearest spot which afforded a suitable bed.

As Darwin pointed out, whenever a dog lies down he curls

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

himself round several times, as if he were twisting the long grass of the prairie or jungle into a comfortable nest.

Although we may safely say that the dog is the most thoroughly tamed of any animal which we possess, yet it is easy to trace every faculty in him which we find useful to the needs of the time when he was wholly engaged in managing his own affairs.

It is worth while to take notice of any distinctive trait of dogs you are familiar with and to think out its probable origin under purely natural conditions. Thus the watchdog's habit of barking when a stranger approaches is clearly traceable to the alarm given by the sentries of the pack when an enemy approached their lair.

The cat, in spite of the domestic character it has acquired, is in reality the least tame of our animal servants. As far as its duties are concerned man has taught it practically nothing. Its methods of pursuing rats, mice, and birds are all entirely its own. It is indeed rather a wild animal which has taken up its residence in our houses for its own purposes than a servant or a slave.

In bringing this series of articles on *Wild Traits in Tame Animals* to a close, let me say again that it has been my aim to suggest rather than to instruct. I am a strong believer in the doctrine that if you want to get a good grip of any fact you must dig it out yourself. There is no doubt that while we are young our senses, such as sight and hearing, are more acute than in adult civilized life; and our powers of observation generally are more alert. In solving the many problems in Natural History which have hitherto baffled our wise men these are the very faculties which are wanted. But they must be combined with the power to reflect on the evidence gathered, and to sift out the rubbish from among the wheat. Even the most learned men know so little of the complex conditions of animal life, that original research is within the power of any one who is content to begin as a careful observer of the facts to be noticed immediately around him.

LOUIS ROBINSON.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE POWER OF THE BRITISH PRESS.

BY HENRY W. LUCY.

In a case affecting theatrical rights recently heard in the London law courts, two well-known managers appearing in the witness box took the opportunity of affirming their absolute disregard, not to say contempt, for articles published in the press purporting to be dramatic criticism. One in the excitement of the competitive examination said he never read notices of pieces in which he was personally concerned. In a calmer moment his colleague wrote to the newspapers to explain that his assertion was strictly limited to notices of pantomimes and did not affect criticism passed upon comedies and other high-class workmanship in vogue at the theatre with which he was connected. The other manager remained impenitent, or at least mute.

This attack on the alleged potency of the press, as affecting public opinion, is the more notable, as coming from a quarter where scepticism on the matter seems least likely to exist. If it be true that the press notices of plays have no value, it must be admitted that managers take extraordinary pains to procure what they believe to be worthless. The incident is useful as raising the question whether journalists have for these many years past been living in a fool's paradise; whether the public have remained under a delusion, and whether "that mighty engine, the press," is after all what Mr. Carlyle liked to call a "simulacrum." Can a newspaper or a congeries of newspapers make the fortune of a play, sell a book or a picture, or make the fortunes of a man?

I think the answer is that everything depends on the play, the book, the picture, or the man. If there is nothing of merit in any of them, not all the newspapers in the kingdom, morning and evening combined, with the weeklies thrown in, can force

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

them into favor with the public. But, undoubtedly, given merit or capacity, recognition of the press is of inestimable value.

It must nevertheless be admitted that the force of its influence is apparently not absolutely in proportion to its integrity of purpose or to its absolute freedom from personal motive. Since the Panama bubble burst, evidence has been forthcoming in abundant detail showing how the "opinion" of a large section of the French press was sold and bought in much the same direct way in which the domestic *gigot* is provided, or a new hat procured. The managers, editors, and, where humbler fry got the chance, the contributors of respectable-looking journals, asked for so many thousand francs as the price of approval of the De Lesseps scheme, threatening if the money were not forthcoming to indignantly denounce it for the protection of the public.

Lower depths were reached in the more recent case of M. Lebaudy. This hapless inheritor of millions of francs, made in the sugar business, having been drawn by conscription, half a dozen newspapers fastened upon him like wasps on the oozing joints of the paternal sugar vats. Newspapers were even called into existence with the same high object in view. It simply was to keep an eye on the young conscript, and unless much money were forthcoming see that his wealth procured for him no privileges beyond those shared in common with his comrades. If supplies of money were withheld, the officers, commissioned and non-commissioned, who had anything to do with Lebaudy, were in the sacred name of France denounced for having sold their favors.

To the English newspaper reader it will appear that enterprise of this character would not pay. The influence wielded by journals capable of embarking upon it would be so obviously infinitesimal that it would not be worth while to hand out any money to pacify or suborn the harpies who conducted it. That amiable conviction is refuted by the fact. M. de Lesseps and his colleagues financing the Panama Canal, paid subventions to the French press representing an appreciable percentage on their takings from the French people. Poor Lebaudy gave with both hands to the journalistic brigands. They were insatiable, and the actuality of the power they boasted was demonstrated by the fact, confessed by the regimental doctor, that, with full

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

knowledge of the conscript's dangerous state of health, he dare not, for fear of these journals, furnish the certificate which in the case of a poorer man would have secured Lebaudy's discharge. So the young millionaire died of consumption in a military hospital.

That is a grim illustration of the power of the press, which, for the sake of an honorable profession, it is hoped is confined to the country that was the scene of its development. It is certain that nothing based upon its primer condition could happen in Great Britain. An English newspaper may be lacking in all the qualities that go to make a daily or a weekly news-sheet acceptable. But the poorest in condition is free from taint of deliberate blackmailing. There are occasionally hints current in financial circles of newspapers launched with the design of preying upon company promoters. But the mere suspicion of such design attached to a newspaper in London or any provincial centre of financial activity is sufficient to defeat the purpose of its proprietors. It forthwith loses any standing or influence it might have honestly attained. Its good word is not worth buying, nor is its hostility to be feared. It may be accepted as an unassailable axiom in respect of the English press that the higher is the standing of a newspaper, the wider the range of its influence, the more unapproachable it is by those who come with money bribes in hand.

Another malign influence from which the British press, as compared with the Continental press, is free is that of the ruling powers. At grave international crises, such as those which shook the world on the eve of Christmas and on the threshold of the New Year, we read of *mots d'ordre* being given from the highest quarters to the press throughout a particular imperial state. When certain journals set forth certain views, they are discussed in London and New York, not as the opinions of leading journals in either capital would be weighed elsewhere, but as indicating the attitude which the Emperor of Germany, the Czar, the Emperor of Austria, or the King of Italy is pleased to take at a particular juncture. That is a guidance that would be looked for in vain in a London newspaper. When a Conservative Government is in power in England it is customary to speak of the *Times*—it used to be the *Standard*—as "the ministerial organ." Whilst a Liberal ministry was yet with us the *Daily News* was so distinguished.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

All that was meant was that the line taken in the editorial columns of these journals was the one Her Majesty's ministers were inclined or resolved to pursue. Such might, by accident, be the case. It is a reasonable conclusion that a journal in sympathy with the policy of a particular party should, at a given turn of events, fall in line with the leaders of it. That is, however, a very different thing from what obtains in the case of some well-known Continental journals, which, at particular crises, receive definite communications from ruling personages and must needs obey them. Probably the worst thing an English Prime Minister, desiring to further a particular line of policy, could do would be to send a message to the editor of the so-called ministerial organ, instructing him, or even inviting him, to adopt a stated line of argument or assertion.

The power of the press in England is mainly based on conviction of its honesty of purpose, and the cleanness of the hands of those who conduct and contribute to it. This inborn, carefully nurtured principle is indicated in such a detail as the scorn and indignation excited in journalistic circles at the mere suspicion that an economically transmitted cable message has been unduly elaborated in the sub-editorial room before it appears in print. The *Times* having, as its conductors thought, reason to believe that a news agency had so dealt with a message offered for publication in its columns, indignantly denounced the misplaced industry. The news agency, justly appreciating the fact that such an accusation, unrefuted, struck at its life as a prosperous business undertaking, forthwith brought a civil action with design to vindicate its integrity. Some of the best known Parisian papers, without fear of rebuke, habitually "convey" telegrams from the London press, re-write them, and present them to their readers as evidence of enterprise, regardless of cost. An English newspaper convicted of such a trick might at once close the shutters of its publishing office.

Another device to enlarge the circle of readers, familiar in France, and not absolutely unknown, I believe, in the United States, is the publication, in the form of reputable news, of the account of an earthquake, a thrilling murder, a rattling tornado, or a romantic suicide, the scene judiciously located. The fact that the story is wholly fabulous has the recommendation that it gives to the journal purveying it exclusive possession of the news.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Something of that kind once appeared in a London morning newspaper. It was a detailed account of a man and dog fight, the scene of which patient inquiry failed to localize, nor was any witness discovered to testify to the alleged occurrence. The managers of the journal in question having been themselves imposed upon, the paper did not permanently suffer. But the picturesque and really able journalist who had depicted the scene has disappeared from prominent places of English journalism.

A marked difference between the profession of journalism in England and its pursuit in the United States and France, is that in the former case it leads no whither beyond possible promotion, whilst in the two latter countries it is the avenue to the highest and most honorable employment in the state. Mr. Gladstone's brief government from 1892 to 1895 was distinguished by a departure, the novelty of which excited profound astonishment, not entirely dissociated from a vague feeling that something was wrong. The Prime Minister recommended nearly half a dozen working journalists to Her Majesty for the honor of knighthood.

In France, Ollivier, Clemenceau, and His Excellency M. Barére, are among the many who have laid down the journalist's pen to take up the minister's portfolio. In the United States the power of the press, as indicated by the personal advancement of prominent members of the guild, is even more frequently and systematically illustrated.

The British press have no parallel to the roll thus blazoned in America. It has, indeed, not even the beginning of such a list. Connection with the press in at least one direction actually disqualifies a man for an honor open to the ordinary citizen. Up to a recent date the Lord Chancellor, for occult reasons, declined to add to the Commission of the Peace a man, otherwise eligible, who was tainted by editorial or proprietorial connection with the press. Lord Herschell broke through this tradition in one or two instances. But his successor on the Woolsack, Lord Halsbury, has reverted to the old order of things.

I am aware of only two instances where the government of the day having patronage at their disposal have bestowed it upon a journalist. In 1869 the then editor of the *Daily News* was offered the practically sinecure post of editor of the *London Gazette*, to which is attached the salary of £800 a year. A writer on the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

editorial staff of the same paper was later nominated to fill a vacancy in the post of examiner of plays. When last year, Mr. Pigott died, there was a rush of veteran journalists eager to secure the reversion of the post. But the minister in whose hand patronage was vested thought enough had been done for the press and a new examiner of plays was found in another profession.

This seems a hard case as compared with the condition of things established not only in the United States and France, but in many of the British colonies. I, for one, am not disposed to regret it. It contributes in no small degree to the absolute independence which is the proudest attribute of the British press. No man can serve two masters! A paper is more likely to thrive if its editor and staff of contributors are habituated to concentrate their attention on their work without contemplating the possibilities of obtaining a government berth at home or a diplomatic appointment abroad.

The power of the press in England might become even dangerously autocratic but for a lack of cohesion. If there existed amongst newspapers any organization akin to Trades Unions the British newspapers might rule the roost. Unfortunately (perhaps fortunately), every paper, whether daily or weekly, stands aloof from its contemporaries, or comes in contact with them only for the purposes of a scolding match. The idea in every British newspaper office, small or large, is that the sheet it turns out is, if not literally the only one printed that morning, the only one worthy of notice. This curious delusion is carried to such lengths that, for fear of breaking the spell, no well-regulated morning paper will mention another by name. If temptation to show how foolish or unreliable a neighbor has been prove irresistible, it is loftily alluded to as "a contemporary."

An example of how this lack of unity works in business relations is supplied in connection with the Royal Academy banquet. That is a prominent event of the year. The foremost public men, usually including the Prime Minister, attend and make speeches. The occasion is preeminently one for which those immediately concerned would desire to obtain the widest publicity. To some member on the committee occurred the happy thought that much prized places at the dinner table might be saved for other uses if only a single reporter were

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

invited to the banquet, he being engaged to supply to all the London newspapers a slip containing a full transcript of his notes. A place was accordingly reserved for the *Times* reporter, the other London newspapers being ignored.

Had there existed among the morning press any means or habit of taking counsel and common action together, this precious arrangement would have come to swift and sudden end. It required only that the newspapers thus ignored should boycott the Academy Banquet, and the next year the cause of offence would cease to exist. There was, however, no such machinery for inter-communication between the managers of the morning papers. The *Standard*, to its honor, took an independent course, and in its columns the speeches at the Academy dinner were left unreported. In 1886 the *Daily News*, coming under new editorship, took the same line. The Academicians held out for another year and then capitulated. The lesson has not borne other fruit and the London newspapers, each in its way a power in the land, solemnly stalk along their own pathway, ludicrously ignoring the existence of other pedestrians.

Possibly it is, on the whole, well that the British press should not be united after the fashion of the ancient guilds. If it were, its power in the land might more nearly approach that of the House of Commons than is already achieved.

H. W. Lucy.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ISSUES AND PROSPECTS OF THE CAMPAIGN.

BY SENATOR W. E. CHANDLER AND THE HON. JOSIAH QUINCY.

I.

BEFORE stating what are in fact the leading issues of the coming presidential canvass, a moment may be wisely spent in speculating as to what those issues might possibly have been. It cannot be said that the Republican claims for the votes of the people could have been placed upon any basis different from that laid down by the St. Louis Convention. The principal points put in issue were (1) protection to American industries by means of tariff duties on imported goods; (2) sound money as defined and understood by the great mass of the Republicans, and (3) a patriotic and positive foreign policy. It is also not conceivable that the canvass would have been materially different with any other candidate for President. The Republican party's presentation of its claims, indeed, has been substantially fixed and settled beyond change during several years past.

But the Democratic claim for votes might have been very different from what it in fact is. The platform might have been (1) sound money as understood by the Cleveland Democrats, and (2) hostility to protection by tariff duties in any form. In that event, with any candidate, the Democrats would have been badly beaten at the polls.

Or, on the other hand, the Democratic platform might have been (1) for sound money as above, and (2) as to protection, it might have recognized as unobjectionable in levying tariff duties incidental protection by discrimination in favor of home products. In this event the presidential canvass would have been comparatively free from excitement, possibly tame, flat, and uninteresting The Populists would have made little figure with their demon-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

strations; the seceding silver Republicans would have accomplished little more than the carrying of three or four mountain States for silver; and although the South would have been generally Democratic, and the Republican victory would not have been overwhelming, yet the triumph would have been sure, complete, and in every way satisfactory in its essential results.

Passing from this speculation as to what the aspect of the presidential canvass possibly might have been, and coming to the actual situation, we find it to be this :

The claims of the Republicans are substantially as above indicated.

I. More distinctly, they are in favor of protection to American industries and to high wages for American labor by tariff duties imposed with the direct motive of affording such protection, while articles not produced in this country are to come in free of duty or with light duties, and in the case of these latter products the nations from which they come are to be induced upon the principle of reciprocity to admit free of duty the important staple products of the United States.

II. The Republicans are pledged to sound money ; that is to say, to absolute and unqualified opposition to the free and unlimited coinage of silver bullion by the United States alone as an immediate measure of legislation—which, if it followed as a result of the approaching presidential canvass, would send gold at once to a premium, and destroy the present parity between gold and silver.

Making now no statement of the other important but not equally vital issues of the pending canvass, the two above-stated principles are the fighting issues of the Republicans. To represent them, Major McKinley is the presidential candidate. His nomination was principally due to a popular demand for a return to protection as a governing principle of tariff legislation, which would not accept any other Republican as the best representative of that principle. He is certain to receive the willing support of every Republican satisfied with the principles of his party. Some objections growing out of the contest for his nomination have disappeared and will be forgotten during the campaign. Petty evils will always attend the movements of a great political party, but fortunately, in the case of the Republican party, such evils generally carry with them their own antidote ; and they have

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

done so in this case, as will appear in the course of the next year and a half.

Personally, Major McKinley is a man of upright character and life; warm and tender-hearted without being weak; intellectually strong, without being dogmatic; most thoroughly informed concerning the issues which he represents, and sure to constitute a cabinet of the ablest men of the nation, who, with the President, will prove safe and sound custodians of the national interests and the national honor.

The regular organization of the Democratic party, which has nominated Bryan and Sewall at Chicago, presents, against McKinley, protection, and sound money, a platform containing:

I. Denunciation of protection in any form. The absolute unconstitutionality either of direct or of incidental protection is not asserted as it was in the Cleveland platform of 1892, but the hostility of the Democratic party to protection of any sort is quite as distinctly marked as in the previous platform. No suggestion is made that if by any possibility the Democratic party has national power given to it, any law levying customs duties will be designed in any part to aid in protecting American products and the wages of American workmen from the competition of foreign products and the starvation wages of Europe and Asia.

The failure to "ease up" in that hostility to protection which has done so much to weaken the Democratic party during the last two years, is a marked feature, quite natural, to be sure, of a new political movement, the purpose of which is to enable the solid South, united with a sufficient number of Western States, to take possession of the national government.

II. A demand for unsound money; that is to say, for the immediate passage of a law which, without conditions, shall provide for receiving and coining at the mints of this country all the silver bullion which may be presented for coinage, at the ratio of 16 to 1, the parity between gold and silver to be thereby immediately broken, gold to be driven out of circulation, and the discarded silver of the whole world to be taken into our mints; all this as a fixed and permanent national policy.

A mere statement of the issues in the condensed form above adopted would seem to be sufficient to justify the prediction that there can be but one result of the canvass, namely, the triumph

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of McKinley and the Republican party. There are, however, other pertinent facts to be considered.

On the money issue the Chicago Convention in effect fell to pieces. Two-thirds of the delegates being in favor of the money plank and having the power to nominate a candidate, the so-called sound-money Democrats from the North and East, who with their associates comprised a little less than one-third of the delegates, after having vainly struggled to prevent the adoption of that plank, sat silent in the Convention to the number of 160 while a candidate was being nominated. What these sound-money Democrats will do in the canvass is not yet apparent. They may content themselves without formal action, remain inactive in their respective localities, and allow or promote a shrinkage of the Democratic vote by Democratic abstentions and the casting of many Democratic ballots for McKinley; or there may be a sound-money Democratic National Convention, which will present another Democratic candidate for the Presidency, and the split in the party will thus become marked and formal. The extent of Mr. McKinley's triumph will hardly be varied whichever course the Northern Democrats pursue.

It is suggested that the Republicans, in order to get Democratic votes for Mr. McKinley, ought to moderate their tariff notions and recognize the demand for honest money as the paramount issue of the canvass. This suggestion is not wise. A Republican Congress, even with a clear, unconditional majority for protection in the Senate, which it does not seem possible to obtain, will not be likely to adopt an extreme tariff measure. But the tariff plank must stand as it is written, binding all Republicans, or we shall lose more Republican votes than we shall gain Democratic votes. On the other hand, a sound-money Democrat can vote for McKinley on the currency issue without committing himself in the least to protection or to any further connection with the Republican party.

What the Populists will do is at the moment of this writing quite uncertain. Undoubtedly Bryan is their logical candidate, for he has been of late more a Populist than a Democrat; yet on the other hand is Sewall, the candidate for Vice-President, who, although he theoretically favors the free coinage of silver, is a millionaire who has become wealthy in connection with protected monopolies. Even if the Populists consummate their seizure of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Democratic party, and formally endorse their representative, Mr. Bryan, and accept Sewall as well, and whether the fight in favor of McKinley is hard or easy, the result, it now seems, will be an overwhelming Republican triumph.

The confident tone of the foregoing prediction is not based solely upon an opinion as to the result of a simple, unclouded contest between the partisans of free coinage of silver, on the one side, and the advocates of what will be called sound money, on the other. On that naked issue, unaffected by other considerations, it must be admitted that the fight would be a doubtful one. The supporters of Bryan would claim that it was a fight between silver monometallism on the one hand and gold monometallism on the other. On this issue thus sharply drawn there would be danger of Republican defeat in every Southern State, in all the States west of the Missouri River, and in some of the States east of the Mississippi, particularly in Illinois and Indiana. The evils of gold monometallism would be pointed out in strong, and, in the main, justifiable language. The necessity, as between the single gold standard and the single silver standard, of adopting the latter would be brought home adroitly and effectively to all persons burdened by debts; also to the agricultural producers and to a very large proportion of all the other producers, and of the merchants of the country.

It will be difficult in such a heated and excited contest as is evidently before the 12,000,000 American voters for editors and speakers to adopt any middle ground between the two extremes of gold monometallism and silver monometallism. Conservatives like myself, who are bimetallists from conviction, will find it difficult to prove to the acceptance of the voters that the McKinley Republicans or the sound-money Democrats, whether the latter do or do not present a candidate, are as much against permanent acquiescence in the single gold standard as we are opposed to the single silver standard. Yet such is in truth the position of the Republican party. Such was its attitude in 1892. In its platform of 1896, also, it pledges itself to promote bimetallism. The Republicans in Congress, when the purchasing clause of the silver law of 1890 was repealed, voted for the following bimetallic declaration:

"And it is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States to continue the use of both gold and silver as standard money, and to coin both

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gold and silver into money of equal intrinsic and exchangeable value, such equality to be secured through international agreement, or by such safeguards of legislation as will insure the maintenance of the parity in value of the coins of the two metals, and the equal power of every dollar at all times in the markets, and in the payment of debts. And it is hereby further declared that the efforts of the government should be steadily directed to the establishment of such a safe system of bimetallism as will maintain at all times the equal power of every dollar coined or issued by the United States, in the markets and in the payment of debts."

The above views are the opinions to-day of four-fifths of the Republicans of the country. They ought to have been more forcibly expressed than they are in the national platform. Yet they are there, clearly defined and honestly uttered. Whenever the wild Democratic and Populist craze for breaking the parity between the two metals and adopting free silver coinage shall pass away, as did the greenback craze of twenty years ago, the Republican party, if in power in the nation, will address itself to the work of securing bimetallism. We are pledged to do that, either in co-operation with other nations or else by United States legislation, whenever such safeguards can be adopted as will be reasonably certain to prevent breaking the parity between the two metals and giving us two kinds of dollars, one kind of less value than the other.

The question of the world's money of final redemption is not one of a day or a year or a decade, but of long periods of time. The mistake of several nations in or about 1873 cannot be rectified as the result of a wild commotion of the American people alone. It cannot be done by Bryan, Sewall, Altgeld, Tillman, George Fred. Williams, and their turbulent followers of to-day. It must be done by the judicious and persistent action of the conservative forces of society, the intelligent men of all parties co-operating in the adoption of a wise monetary system which shall correct the errors of the past, and base the money of the future upon foundations of justice to all classes of society.

It is the present opinion of the bimetallists of Europe that free silver coinage now by the United States alone would be an obstacle rather than a help to bimetallism. They say that silver monometallism is as bad as gold monometallism, and that progress toward the former is the destruction of the hopes of bimetallists. The friends of the double standard certainly ought to give heed to this general opinion of European bimetallists, and not rush recklessly into silver monometallism. England, it is true, nom-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

inally insists that she will never give up the single gold standard, but her position will be a mere harmless theory provided she opens the mints of India to the coinage of silver, as she appears to be willing to do whenever the United States, France, and Germany are willing to arrange for the restoration of silver to unlimited coinage. The cause of bimetallism is not hopeless, but now stands still to await the result of the attempt of the Bryan and Altgeld Democracy to make the United States permanently a silver monometallic nation. Difficult as it will be to secure a hearing for these views during the coming canvass, it is from the standpoint of bimetallism that the fight against the Bryan candidacy should be made.

The issue, however, which I have admitted would be doubtful if simply and sharply defined as one between silver monometallism on the one side and either gold monometallism or bimetallism on the other, is not to be the whole issue. That may appear to be the issue in form. The real issue is substantially different. There is the added fact that the great mass of the careful, conservative, and prudent people of the country will be upon the side of McKinley, while practically all the Anarchists, Socialists, and destructives in society will rush to the support of Bryan. Mr. Bryan cannot reject these supporters, nor nullify the fatal effect of their friendship by disclaiming sympathy with their extreme views. Even if the Populists nominate a third ticket, it will be supported only by the harmless theorists of whom Senator Peffer is the leader and the idol. The real enemies of society, the men who arouse the mobs in our cities, and in order to remedy evils, sometimes fancied, sometimes real, would resist the officers of the law, destroy property, burn buildings, and commit homicides, will rush naturally to the support of the candidates nominated at Chicago. They cannot be shaken off. They will find in the platform much encouragement. They will find still more in a part of Mr. Bryan's speech made immediately after his nomination, in which he invites desperate people who want to repudiate their honest debts to give him their votes. He said :

"I once heard a story of a man at a hotel who could not sleep because the man in the room above walked the floor all night. At last the man below, in despair, asked his friend above why he continued to walk the floor throughout the night. The friend replied: 'I owe $10,000, and it is due next week. I think it is about time to walk the room all night.' 'But, my friend, why don't you go to sleep and let the other man do the walking?' "

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In the platform an income tax is demanded, notwithstanding the decision of the Supreme Court. It is not to be a just income tax, equal upon all property, except as to slight exemptions to help citizens to obtain the necessaries of life before paying a tax, but it is to be a graduated income tax, adopted with the unconcealed purpose of taxing great fortunes out of existence. If the Supreme Court continues to stand in the way, it is to be reconstructed by new laws and new appointments by President Bryan. Where so much is expressed the wild men of society will believe that much more is meant.

Therefore, apart from the language of the platform and the letters of acceptance of the candidates, the issue has inevitably made itself. It is between security to property and personal rights, and peaceful prosperity maintained by the friends of law and order, on the one side, and, on the other, Anarchy and Socialism, promoted by the advocates of public disorder and riotous violence as a means of redressing supposed grievances, who propose to convert our free, intelligent republic into a form of government as little swayed by reason and virtue as was the late Chicago mob, misnamed a Democratic Convention, which deliberately, in the year 1896, undertook to organize the solid South, with a few States of the West, to menace the property and prosperity of the North and East, by as wicked a movement as that after which it was deliberately patterned, the Southern rebellion of 1861.

The time of trial to the Republican party will come after its approaching victory. It will then be in order to determine whether it is the slave of the rich capitalists, of the promoters of trusts and monopolies, and of the bloated bondholders, as the Bryan Democrats (not the Sewall Democrats) and the Populists will contend. Its mission just now is to prevent repudiators, Anarchists, Socialists, and other enemies of organized society from achieving the first success in the work of tearing down the whole social fabric upon which rest the peace and prosperity of our country.

WM. E. CHANDLER.

II.

An Eastern Democrat, returning from witnessing the revolutionizing of the principles and of the control of his party at the Chicago Convention, unable to transform himself into an advo-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cate either of the free coinage of silver or of populism, and yet equally unable to give his support to Mr. McKinley and the Republican party, finds himself in a puzzling political predicament; if unwilling to bolt his party ticket, he yet cannot conscientiously advise others that the good of the country requires them to give their support to the principles embodied in his party platform. Standing in this attitude, the present writer will attempt in this article briefly to analyze the political causes of the extraordinary conditions within the Democratic party, and affecting it from the outside, which have now culminated in the Chicago platform and in the nomination of Mr. Bryan, and the prospects of the political success of the new departure.

Of course the situation as it appears now, immediately after the adjournment of the Convention, may be modified by the developments of the next few weeks, and may be entirely changed either way within the course of the next few months. No one can prophesy with any certainty the direction the popular mind will take in a political crisis such as is now upon the country. The most careful forecast of political probabilities may be entirely upset by a pronounced movement of public sentiment,—if it occurs not in the East only but throughout the country,—in one direction or the other. A strong and general movement in behalf of a bolting Democratic ticket, if a leader of standing accepted a position at its head, might, for instance, destroy Mr. Bryan's chances. All that will here be attempted, therefore, is some estimate of the case as it stands at the present moment. The great question is, what does this political revolution in the Democratic party signify? Whence has it come? Having swept that party off its feet in the nominating convention, is it going to revolutionize the political control of the country also at the polls?

One thing is clear; the time has gone by when the political movement for monetary reform, which has now expressed itself in the demand of the Chicago platform for the free, independent, and unlimited coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1, can be laughed out of court with mere ridicule, or killed by mere denunciation. Nothing is to be gained by simply shrieking "Populists, repudiators, and Anarchists" at those who have proved themselves numerous enough to exercise complete control over the present course of one of the great political parties

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the country. It is the duty of conservative men, even though they have shrunk from the idea of assuming any share of the responsibility for the Chicago platform, with its possibilities, at least, of immense disaster to the country, to endeavor to understand the spirit and purpose behind the radical political programme which has now been put forward, to appreciate the strength of the forces back of it, and especially to do whatever may be possible during the coming campaign to prevent political division from running on sectional or class lines.

In the first place, as to the presidential candidate of the Chicago Convention. However weak the nomination of Mr. Bryan might be under other conditions, or upon a different platform, there is every reason to believe that he is the best possible nominee for the Democratic party in its present situation, from the mere standpoint of success at the coming election. Candidate and platform are in complete accord. On such a radical platform there would have been no appreciable advantage in nominating a man of more conservative views and instincts. If success with such a programme be possible, it needs a man with the enthusiasm and audacity of youth to achieve it. Ordinarily, it would not be good policy for a great political party to nominate for the presidency, chiefly upon his ability as an orator, a man of Mr. Bryan's youth, comparative lack of experience in public affairs, and radicalism of views. But in the face of the present situation, the very boldness of the nomination gives it a certain strength. The exigency called for a candidate possessed of personal magnetism, able to give eloquent expression before a popular audience to the sentiments underlying the movement. The sort of warfare which may be expected from him may prove more effective than is now anticipated in some quarters. The instinct of the Convention in selecting the presidential nominee, for the first time in the history of American politics, from a State west of the Mississippi, was a sound one from the standpoint of political expediency. A Western candidate will win far more support in that section of the country than a Southern candidate could do, while he will probably hold the South about as well as a Southern man. Upon the platform adopted, the obvious policy of the party was to play for the Populist vote; to make an entirely new departure, creating a new party under an old name. The nomination of Mr. Bryan is more consistent with this policy than any

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

other which could have been made, unless indeed Senator Teller could have been taken up, and the unwisdom of nominating him was recognized by nearly everybody in the Convention. The past political course of the candidate commends him at least as much to Populists as to Democrats. Before these lines can be read the action of the Populist Convention at St. Louis will have been taken; the writer thinks it safe to assume that either Mr. Bryan will be endorsed, or that some arrangement will be made, then or later, by which he can secure the Populist votes.

The nomination of Mr. Sewall, of Maine, for Vice-President, while made in the Convention upon the spur of the moment, and chiefly for the purpose of avoiding possible mistakes in other directions, is mainly significant as indicating a desire to refute the idea that the new movement is a sectional one of the South and the farther West against the East; probably it was also intended to afford a conspicuous demonstration of the fact that every successful business man will not necessarily be opposed to the Democratic party in its new policy.

Looking first at the coming presidential contest merely from the standpoint of the popular vote, the one fact of prime significance, which must not be overlooked, is that 1,041,000 votes were cast in 1892 for Weaver, the Populist candidate for President, or nearly nineteen per cent. as many votes as were given to Cleveland. To be sure, this vote practically includes the whole Democratic vote in the States of Colorado, Idaho, Kansas, North Dakota, and Wyoming, where no Democratic electors were placed in nomination. Deducting a fair estimate of the Democratic vote in these States, the straight Populist vote still amounts to over 900,000, or over one-sixth of the vote cast for Cleveland.

Nor should it be forgotten, if we try to do justice to the political acumen of the new leaders, that owing to the irreconcilable conflict of opinion existing within the ranks of the Democratic party upon the money question, they were obliged to take one horn or the other of a dilemma. While free-silver coinage at 16 to 1 invited a formidable bolt on the part of Eastern Democrats, a great body of Democratic voters in the South and West were no longer willing to give their support to the party candidate unless upon a platform either declaring directly for free silver, or at least giving the certain assurance of financial legislation securing

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

an enlargement of the circulating medium of the country. The South had accepted the platform of 1892 partly because of the pronounced views of the candidate who was to stand upon it, partly because it specifically promised the repeal of the tax on state bank issues, partly because the currency plank could easily be construed to favor the free coinage of silver at a new ratio, in accordance with its market price. The failure of the Democratic party to support in Congress the repeal of the state bank tax, the construction placed by the administration upon the plank relating to silver, the repeal of the Sherman law without the enactment of any legislation in its place, and finally the issue of $262,000,000 of bonds, primarily and ostensibly for the purpose of purchasing gold to maintain the reserve of that metal, however commendable from the standpoint of Eastern sound-money men this course of action may have been, nevertheless led naturally and inevitably to the position assumed by the delegates of the South and West at Chicago. Their attitude there should have occasioned no surprise to any close observer of recent political tendencies.

In considering the readiness which the Southern Democrats have shown to accept the programme of a union with the Populists, with Mr. Bryan for the common candidate, it should be noted that the Populist party has shown strength enough to make it a factor in politics, on account of the size of its vote or of the closeness of the contest between the two old parties, in almost every State of the South. The Populist vote in Kentucky and Tennessee is so large that both of these States would probably be in doubt at the coming election upon a platform not in sympathy with Populist views. In Arkansas the Populist vote increased from 11,000 in 1892 to 24,000 in 1894; in Georgia, from 42,000 in the former year to 96,000, by means of fusion with the Republicans, in the latter. In North Carolina, Weaver's vote of 44,000 in 1892 became, through fusion with the Republicans, 148,000 in 1894, carrying the State. In Texas the Populist vote grew from 99,000 in 1892 to 159,000 in 1894; in Virginia, from 12,000 in the former year to 81,000 in 1893. In 1892 Weaver received 13,000 votes in Louisiana and 10,000 in Mississippi. At the State elections of 1894, the Populist vote in Alabama was 83,000, and in Missouri 42,000. A little consideration of these figures may enable Eastern men to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

understand better the desire even of the leading politicians of the South to commit the Democratic party to a close alliance with Populism. The plain fact is that the South is honeycombed with Populism, and has been ready for a number of years for the formal alliance with the Populists beyond the Mississippi which has now been consummated at Chicago.

The South has given up, deliberately and probably for an indefinite period of time, its old political alliance in the Northeast, and has entered into a new alliance with the States beyond the Mississippi; it has exchanged the States of New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut, with their 52 doubtful or Democratic electoral votes, for the 83 electoral votes of the farther West, or such of them as it may be able to secure. Indiana, lying half way between the old political allies and the new ones, is doubtless expected by the South to enter into the new combination; but the chances that this State will remain Democratic on the new basis are hardly as good as was the prospect that she would continue Democratic in association with the Eastern States. The new lines of alliance also seek to include the great State of Illinois, and it now seems probable that the chances of placing her in the Democratic column as newly formed are better than the chances that she would have joined Indiana in her political course upon the old basis.

In the South itself the new alliance with Western Populism probably tends to hold Kentucky and Tennessee, which have been becoming doubtful States, more firmly in the Democratic column, to bring North Carolina back into the fold of Democracy, and to hold South Carolina within it, thus tending to make 43 electoral votes more secure for the Democratic party. It would certainly seem that this alliance will, on the other hand, tend to throw Delaware, Maryland, and probably West Virginia also, with their 17 electoral votes, into political affiliation with the North Atlantic States. However unwise future events may show this policy to be from a political standpoint, or however serious may be the results which the success of the new combination may bring to the country, there is certainly no great cause for surprise in the fact that it has commended itself from the standpoint of political expediency, or even necessity, to the judgment of old and tried Southern leaders, such as Senator Jones, of Arkansas.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Chicago Convention furnished a striking demonstration of the fact that the centre of political power in this country has passed away from the East. The new conditions have already clearly manifested themselves in the Senate, though few have awakened to the permanent character of the change, or to the far-reaching influence upon the policies of the country which will inevitably result from it. The majority of the Senate, it must be remembered, can not only exert a considerable influence by its example over the House of Representatives, and through its power of confirmation of appointments over the President himself, but it has an absolute veto power over all legislation. However necessary financial legislation of some sort may be to secure the redeemability of all forms of our currency in gold, or even to protect the very solvency of the Treasury, no measure in this direction can become a law without the consent of a majority of the States of the Union, as represented in the Senate. One of the cardinal points of the present political situation is that the section of the country west of the Mississippi River, which for convenience will hereafter be referred to in this article as the West, has in recent years made an immense gain in votes in the Senate. By the admission since 1889 of the seven new States of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Washington, Idaho, Wyoming, and Utah, having together fourteen votes, the sixteen votes which the West possessed before that year have been nearly doubled. The trans-Mississippi section now has just one-third of the total votes in the Senate; and even this representation will doubtless be increased in the near future by the admission of New Mexico and Arizona into the Union. The sixteen Southern States are represented by thirty-two Senators, so that the South and West together have to-day more than a two-thirds vote in the Senate. With the admission of two new Western States, the South could lose the political control entirely, as it has already lost it partly, of the three States of Delaware, Maryland, and West Virginia, and yet, with the West, control just two-thirds of the Senate. It is, therefore, obvious that with any reasonable concert of action between the South and the West, these two sections of the country together can control the action of the Senate, and can thereby at least prevent the passage of any legislation not in harmony with the views of their people.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Nor can it be denied that this alliance has already plainly manifested itself in the Senate, and that the action of the Chicago Convention in coming out openly for the free coinage of silver, in espousing other political views of a Populistic character which are well regarded in the West, and finally in taking its Presidential nominee from a far Western State, has immensely strengthened the forces which tend to make the connection closer and more permanent.

If we turn to the votes in the Electoral College we find that the South, including Delaware with this section, has 159 votes, and the section west of the Mississippi 83, making a total of 242 votes, or 18 more than the 224 required to elect. Even though the States of Delaware, Maryland, and West Virginia leave the Democratic column with their 17 electoral votes, as they are quite likely to do, a majority still remains; or if the South remains solid, Iowa and any one of ten other Western States might be lost without destroying the majority.

These figures are given not only on account of their bearing upon the coming political contest, but because they indicate also, however roughly, the strength of the alliance which has now been formed within the Democratic party. They are presented with a view to emphasizing the fact that in a presidential contest running upon the general lines which have now been laid down, the Democratic party need not carry a Northern State east of the Mississippi, if it can hold its lines even fairly intact in the South, and can secure nearly the whole of the electoral vote between the Mississippi and the Pacific Ocean. If the vote of either Illinois or Indiana can also be secured, to say nothing of Ohio, Michigan, or Wisconsin, it would make up for a very considerable defection in the far West or South.

Let us now take up the coming contest in view of these figures, and consider what light the recent course of each of the Western States throws upon its probable action at the coming election. The whole theory upon which the Democratic campaign of this year is based is that it is possible to effect a close union of the Democratic and Populist voters, if not a complete fusion of the two parties. If this can be secured without a bolt in the Western States of sound-money Democrats of such dimensions that it cannot be offset by the corresponding defection of silver Republicans which is likely to take place, the figures

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

certainly indicate that the Democratic ticket is likely to carry every State west of the Mississippi, unless it be Iowa.

Of these fifteen Western States, five, namely, Colorado, Idaho, Kansas, North Dakota, and Nevada, were carried for the Populist electoral ticket in 1892, no Democratic electoral ticket being put in the field in the first four of these States. A union of the Democratic and Populist votes in the last presidential election would have carried seven more States, California by 25,000, Minnesota by 7,000, Montana by 6,000, Nebraska by 20,000, Oregon by 6,000, South Dakota by 1,000, Washington by 13,000. This leaves only the three States of Iowa, Wyoming, and Utah; Iowa was carried by the Republicans in 1892 over the combined vote of the Democrats and Populists only by 4,000, and Wyoming went for Harrison over Weaver by only 700 plurality. In 1895 the new State of Utah went Republican in a gubernatorial election by 2,000 plurality; but the division of the Republican party in that State, as evidenced by the bolt of one of its Senators from the St. Louis Convention, and the strong silver sentiment prevailing there, will doubtless make it Democratic at the coming election.

In view of these figures, and of the well-known and pronounced attitude of a majority of the people of the West not only upon silver, but upon other issues embodied in the Democratic platform of this year, there is certainly a strong basis for the assumption that all of the electoral votes of the West, except those of Iowa, will be cast for Bryan. Without obtaining the vote of any Northern State east of the Mississippi, he could afford to lose Iowa and Delaware, or if he could capture the votes of Iowa he could lose those of Delaware, Maryland, and West Virginia.

But it will be claimed upon the other side that Kentucky, and possibly Tennessee as well, may go for McKinley, and thus make such a large breach in the vote of the solid South that it cannot be compensated for in the West. It is doubtless true that the former, perhaps the latter also, of these States will be strongly contested by the Republican managers; if the state of public opinion is such that either or both of them can be detached from the Democratic side, it will doubtless indicate the existence of conditions fatal to Bryan's prospects of success. But let us look at the figures in these two States. It is true that sound-money Democrats are both numerous and influential in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Kentucky, and the government of the State is at present in the hands of the Republican party. But it is probable that the great body of sound-money Democrats who would be willing to go to the length of bolting their party ticket in a presidential election refrained from voting for the last Democratic candidate for Governor, and that this led to the election of the Republican candidate by the 9,000 plurality which he received; on the other hand, there were 17,000 votes cast by the Populists at the last election for their nominee for Governor, leaving the Republican party 8,000 votes short of a majority. In 1892 the combined vote for Cleveland and for Weaver exceeded the vote for Harrison by 63,000; on this basis 30,000 sound-money Democrats could vote for Mr. McKinley without losing the State for Bryan. Taking into account the strength of the Kentucky brand of Democracy in a presidential contest, it seems unlikely that the electoral vote of the State will go to McKinley, in spite of the attitude of leading Democratic papers.

In Tennessee the case is very much the same, except that the Republican prospects are not so good. In 1892 the Democratic plurality was 38,000, while the Populist ticket received 23,000 votes. On a total vote for Governor in 1894 considerably less than that of 1892, the State was, to be sure, evenly divided; but if the Populists had voted for the Democratic candidate instead of for their own, the former would have had a plurality of 23,000.

In regard to Maryland, Delaware, and West Virginia, the recent political course of these States, and the strength in all of them of the commercial interests which will be strongly enlisted on the Republican side, together with the strength of the sound-money Democrats in the first two of them, makes it likely that their votes will be found in the Republican column. The Democratic party of Maryland is bady divided by internal dissensions, and the fact that the Republicans carried the State in 1895 by a majority of 18,000, on a total vote 27,000 larger than the presidential vote of 1892, would seem to indicate that the McKinley managers may reasonably hope to secure its electoral vote. Delaware only went for Cleveland by 500 plurality in 1892, and elected a Republican Governor in 1894. Unless the factional quarrel in the Republican party prevents that result, the vote of the State will doubtless be given to McKinley. West Virginia is normally a very close State, and the fact that her vote has been decidedly

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Republican of late, taken in connection with the strength of the financial interests behind McKinley, may well carry the State for him.

Before passing from the South a word should be said as to North Carolina. The Populists have recently outnumbered either the Democrats or the Republicans in this State, and it has recently been controlled by a Republican-Populist fusion. Under other conditions the vote of the State would have been uncertain; but it is doubtless safe for Mr. Bryan on a free-coinage platform.

Let us now consider the possibility of votes for the Democratic ticket in the central section of the country east of the Mississippi. Here we find the doubtful State of Indiana, whose vote has been given to the Democratic party in three of the five last presidential elections, and the State of Illinois, formerly safely Republican, but now placed by her recent political action in the list of uncertain States. These two States will be the real pivotal ones in the coming campaign. If Bryan can carry either of them, the figures above given would seem to indicate that he will in all probability be elected; if, on the other hand, they are both carried for McKinley, the chances would seem to be against Bryan's success, although, as above indicated, he might possibly still succeed in securing an election by receiving the nearly solid electoral votes of the South, and of the farther West. If the Democratic candidate can carry the 24 electoral votes of Illinois, he can lose Delaware, Maryland, and West Virginia in the South, and Iowa and any other single State in the West, or three or four of those with the smallest population, and still carry the election. If he can secure the 15 electoral votes of Indiana, without Illinois, he can afford to lose the three first-named States, together with Iowa and any one of the six Western States having three electoral votes each.

In 1892 Illinois went for Cleveland by 27,000, and the vote for Weaver was 22,000. In 1894 the Populist vote for Treasurer had risen to 60,000. Political conditions in this State are in a chaotic condition, and the only thing that can be said at this writing with any degree of certainty is that the vote would be uncertain if the election were held to-morrow, according to the best information obtainable. It is an open question whether Gov. Altgeld's interest in the national campaign will not be a source of strength rather than of weakness on the Democratic

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

side. Nearly all of the men of conservative opinions who would be repelled from the national ticket by his active support of it are opposed to it in any case on account of the platform. It must be admitted, upon the other hand, however much people in the East may dislike Gov. Altgeld's opinions and actions, that he has shown no mean powers as a political leader, and that he has a large following outside of party lines among the laboring men of the State. He is thoroughly familiar with the politics of the State, and with the methods of campaigning likely to prove most effective; and if he throws himself heartily into the fight for Bryan, as he will doubtless do, particularly as his own re-election is at stake, it will have no small influence upon the result. The fact that the Republican nominee for Governor is admitted by his own party friends to be a very weak candidate, the strength which free silver has had for many years in the country districts of the State, and the great size of the agricultural vote, Illinois having no less than 240,000 farms, further tend to make the result uncertain. The bolt of the sound-money Democrats, either to McKinley or to a third candidate, will of course be a large one, but other factors in the situation may overcome even this defection. Chicago in the coming contest, even if the Democratic national headquarters are not located in that city, as they logically should be, will hold exactly the same position as the centre of the fight which New York city has occupied in so many past elections, and Illinois, the Empire State of the Middle West, will take the place so long occupied by the State of New York as the pivot upon which the contest will turn.

The chances that Indiana will be carried by Bryan do not seem to be so good, in spite of the fact that this State has a much longer Democratic record than Illinois. If the tide sets strongly among the farmers in favor of free silver, Indiana may easily be carried by him, but if the coming campaign resembles those of the past in this State, the amount of money which the Republicans can and will spend to carry it for McKinley, with the moderate supply of campaign funds likely to be found on the Democratic side, may reasonably be expected to result in Republican success.

In the foregoing article, the writer has endeavored briefly to indicate a few of the reasons which seem to him to render the success of the Chicago ticket at least neither impossible nor

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

highly improbable. The average business man of the East is too likely to argue that no programme such as that which has now been adopted by the Democratic party, can possibly receive the endorsement of the people at the polls. If the sound-money sentiment of the whole country is as strong as he assumes it to be, such will doubtless prove to be the case; but it should be remembered that there are a large number of voters who are thoroughly tired of the old political parties and of the leadership which has controlled them, and that before the campaign is over they may be strongly attracted by the prospect of bringing about political disruption through the election of Mr. Bryan. A few months ago, the voters whose first desire was to bring about a change in the policies of the Federal Government were nearly all drifting to the Republican side; but the Democratic party has now cut itself loose so entirely from the present administration and from existing political conditions, that it offers to the country a much more pronounced change than the Republican party. The latter now stands as the champion of the "existing gold standard" and the present financial order, while the former offers a programme of radical and far-reaching change. With the old political fences so completely down, and in the face of conditions so chaotic, there is no warrant for any assurance as to the result of the election in November.

JOSIAH QUINCY.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SOME ANTE-BELLUM POLITICS.

BY THE HON. GEORGE W. JULIAN.

THE pending struggle for the Presidency not only brings with it the customary revival of interest in public questions, but it recalls the campaigns of earlier times which played their part in shaping the politics of to-day. To some of these I propose to refer by way of personal reminiscence, and in order to represent them intelligibly to the present generation, and indicate the lessons which they teach, I shall restate the essential facts and conditions which preceded them and inspired their operations. To-day is the child of yesterday, and whoever would profit by the past must ponder its teachings.

The campaign of 1840 stands by itself in the history of American politics. It had no precedent; and it can never be repeated, because the conditions which made it possible can never be reproduced. No one has adequately described it. The Whigs tendered no defined issues, and, in fact, practically surrendered both their principles and their party identity for the sake of success. General Harrison was a strict-construction Democrat of the straightest sect. He boasted on the stump that he belonged to the school of Jefferson, Mason, and Henry; but, unlike these great men, he believed in negro slavery, and had labored with all his might to introduce it in Indiana, and thus fasten it upon the Northwest. But he was a man of revolutionary blood, and the hero of Tippecanoe. His champions also paraded him as a farmer, and a poor man who lived in a log cabin and drank hard cider; while Van Buren was painted as a ruffle-shirted aristocrat who took his soup from a gold spoon, and was trying to unite the sword and the purse of the nation in his unhallowed clutches. The campaign opened in a memorable crisis of "hard times" and financial troubles, but the promised Whig blessing of "two dol-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lars a day and roast beef" which would certainly follow Harrison's election, and the child-like faith that all wrongs would be righted by a mere change of administration, made the Whig masses supremely happy. They seemed to be riding on a great tidal wave of "joy unspeakable," which swept everything before it. The canvass became a stupendous political frolic. Whiggery was translated into a shout, and the Democrats were silenced by acclamation. They were amazed and dumfounded beyond expression, but their solemn faces only added to the general mirth of the Whigs. The campaign was set to music, and it poured itself forth in doggerel rhymes of every conceivable quality and meter, which perfectly voiced the abounding fun and buffoonery of the hour. The stump speech was entirely subordinated to the song. Monster meetings of the people were the order of the day, and they came together as if by spontaneous impulse. There were cavalcades, military parades, barbecues, processions of log cabins and canoes on wheels, hard cider, and raccoons in abundance, and such an infinite variety of comic and grotesque exhibitions as only the genius of such a campaign could suggest.

Such was this most remarkable of all our presidential struggles. It was the farthest thing possible from a campaign of education, for its management plainly assumed that political knowledge was not wanted and would even be an obstacle to success. But it brought with it two important lessons. In the first place, the election returns disclosed the surprising fact that in the midst of this political whirlwind men were pondering the most serious question that ever made its appeal to the American people, and that over seven thousand of them had cast their votes for James G. Birney, the first anti-slavery candidate for the Presidency. This was the first instalment of that organized political action which culminated in the election of Lincoln and the final overthrow of slavery. In the second place, we see clearly that while Harrison's triumph was overwhelming, his death one month after his inauguration and the succession of John Tyler only precipitated the Whig catastrophe which was made inevitable by a campaign in which principles were given to the winds, and availability was made the sole basis of action and bond of union. These valuable lessons should be accepted as some atonement for the folly and mischief of the great hard-cider inundation.

The campaign of 1844 was totally different. In the Demo-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cratic National Convention of May 27, Van Buren was thrown overboard because of his opposition to the immediate annexation of Texas, and James K. Polk nominated as the special champion of that idea. Van Buren, then so well known throughout the country as "a Northern man with Southern principles," now demonstrated that not even so great a temptation as the Presidency, which was placed conditionally within his grasp, could swerve him from his convictions of public duty. The Whigs had had enough of the racket and nonsense of 1840. Sobered and chastened by their folly, their National Convention of May 1 unanimously nominated Henry Clay as their standard-bearer. This left no doubt about the issues, for Clay was everywhere regarded as "the embodiment of Whig principles." On the burning question of annexation he was unequivocally committed. He declared that annexation would be followed by war with Mexico, while all parties saw that it would bring into the Union a large area of slave territory, and thus powerfully strengthen the growing ascendancy of slavery over the national government. The issues of the canvass were vital, for they involved the fortunes of the Republic, as now clearly seen in the light of subsequent events. Clay had now reached the age of sixty-seven, but he was in the full possession of his powers, with the added charms of ripeness and dignity, with which time had touched and beautified his commanding personality. I had read his speeches from my boyhood, and had met him and heard him speak two years before, when he visited Indiana. As one of his young disciples, and a member of the great brotherhood of his political idolators, I entered the canvass and made my first stump speeches, which, in their spirit and substance, were similar to those which I made four years later as a Free Soil leader. The confidence of the Whigs in Clay's triumph was unbounded. Now, at last, they felt sure that the opportunity had come to crown their great chief with the honor he had so long coveted. This confidence seemed to be justified by facts. The nomination of so small and obscure a competitor as Polk was laughed at by the Whigs, and the Democrats themselves seemed at first a little depressed. The Whig tariff of 1842 was very popular, and Clay was in the noon-day of his fame. Webster was not now on the presidential anxious seat, and cordially supported the ticket; and, in fact, there seemed to be a jubilant unanimity of feeling

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in the party which gave promise of a rousing victory. And this was no transient feeling. It sustained the Whigs till the last moment of the canvass. Indeed, Clay himself, in common with his friends, believed he was victorious till the evening of the day following the election. Nothing could shake their faith. The Democrats early in the struggle rallied from their temporary apathy, and gave their united and enthusiastic efforts to Polk; but this did not disturb the Whigs, whose courage and faith never faltered. The fight was a grand one, and it was for principles. The great leaders of both parties entered the field. It was a battle between giants. In every respect it contrasted splendidly with the campaign for "Tippecanoe and Tyler too." But the fates, as usual, were against the Whigs. In Louisiana, the Plaquemine election frauds gave that State to Polk. The unfortunate outbreak of Nativism in our chief cities proved disastrous to the Whigs. Polk's Kane letter, committing himself to the policy of a revenue tariff with incidental protection, which was translated into "Polk, Dallas, and the Tariff of 1842," and emblazoned on the Democratic banners, took Pennsylvania from Clay and gave it to Polk. And the seven thousand votes for Birney in 1840 were now swelled to over sixty-two thousand, of which enough in the State of New York alone were withheld from Clay, on account of his vacillating letters on the question of annexation, to give that State to Polk. Thus faded away the fond hopes and intoxicating dreams of a great Whig victory.

When the returns at last made it certain that the "obscure Tennesseean" had triumphed, the disappointment and humiliation of Clay's friends became unutterable. I have known nothing like it in the history of politics. In my own immediate neighborhood, I found prominent Whigs so prostrated by the defeat that they took to their beds and could neither eat nor sleep for days and nights in succession. Kindred experiences must have been innumerable. The sorrow of the Whigs was not merely heartfelt but heart-rending. To them all the joy of life seemed to have fled, and they utterly refused to be comforted. They felt that an overwhelming preponderance of the virtue and intelligence of the country stood behind Clay, while the larger element of ignorance and "unwashed" humanity, including Southern fire-eaters, slavery extensionists, nullifiers, and the vicious and criminal classes in all the great cities, had voted him down. They believed

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that no statesman of eminence could ever be made President, and their faith in free government for the time completely gave way; while Clay himself was overwhelmed by letters of condolence, which poured in upon him from every section of the Union, and thus gave a keener edge to his disappointment.

But the defeat of Clay was by no means a national calamity. Texas was annexed before Polk came into power, and it would have been annexed at no distant day if Clay had been elected. The poison of slavery had so entered into the life of the people, and the habit of submission to its demands had become so confirmed, that the triumph of Polk and immediate annexation only quickened the inevitable march of events. It was simply an incident of the great conflict which was to be decided at last by the ordeal of battle.

The campaign of 1848 was largely shaped and inspired by the great historic events which preceded it. The Mexican war, which logically followed the annexation of Texas, had added California and New Mexico to our national territory, and the evident purpose of the South to spread slavery over these regions quite naturally gave birth to the Wilmot Proviso, or the Congressional prohibition of slavery therein. Both the Whigs and Democrats of the Northern States were in favor of this proviso, but they wavered and faltered because their brethren in the South were against it, and the party harmony was thus endangered. This led to the formation of the Free Soil Party, which was the first formidable attempt to carry the slavery question into politics. It was a tremendous venture, and had no justification in any calculations of profit and loss. It was an open defiance of public opinion, and an insurrection against the long-established and growing power of the South. It was a declaration of war against the Whig and Democratic parties, which had become the bulwarks of slavery, and it could not fail to arouse a powerful and embittered hostility.

The Democratic National Convention met on the 22d of May, and Lewis Cass was nominated. He had been the zealous champion of the Wilmot Proviso the year before, but he now favored the policy of popular sovereignty in the Territories, as expounded in his famous Nicholson letter. It was not all that the South wanted, but with General Cass as its practical interpreter, it was accepted as a provisional policy.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Whig National Convention met on the 7th of June. The defeat of Clay in 1844 had demoralized the party, and it was now ready for another investment in the folly of availability. Remembering its success with General Harrison, the Convention nominated General Taylor, who had never been known as a Whig, and had never cast a vote. The Whigs had always denounced the war with Mexico as a war of conquest unconstitutionally begun by President Polk; but they now made the hero of this war their standard-bearer as their chosen means of political success. The Whigs of the free States professed to favor the Wilmot Proviso; but their nominee was a large Louisiana slave-owner, who was entirely acceptable to the South, and in whose hands, according to every reasonable presumption, the interests of the South would be perfectly safe. As if to demonstrate all this, the Convention contemptuously voted down the Wilmot Proviso, the result of which was the immediate desertion of many thousands of Whigs, and the final dissolution of the party.

The Free Soil National Convention met at Buffalo on the 9th of August. It was an immense mass convention, called together for the purpose of organizing a new party, and composed of elements that had never before acted together; but their enthusiasm was unbounded. The movement represented the Whigs of the Northern States, who were dissatisfied with the nomination of General Taylor and the repudiation of the Wilmot Proviso; the Democrats who could not support General Cass since his change of base as proclaimed in his Nicholson letter, and who longed for the opportunity to rebuke their party for its treatment of Van Buren four years before; and the Liberty Party, which was now ready to disband and affiliate with a larger movement committed to its essential doctrines. An admirable platform of principles was agreed upon, and the somewhat discordant elements finally harmonized by the nomination of Martin Van Buren for President and Charles Francis Adams for Vice-President. The campaign opened with the watchwords, "Van Buren and Free Soil, Adams and Liberty," and the contest was bitter and remorseless beyond all precedent. It is impossible now to conceive the immeasurable wrath and scorn which were lavished upon the men who deserted the old parties. The fight became ferocious, and the warfare between the Whigs and Free Soilers in the West was only matched by that of the Barnburners

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and Old Hunkers in New York. Among the great Free Soil leaders in that State, John Van Buren, or "Prince John" as he was then named by common consent, was the "bright particular star." He was tall, graceful, and commanding. As a stump speaker he was a genius. His power over a great audience was phenomenal. Men of all shades of opinion were drawn to him by the indescribable charm of his personality. In repelling the savage assaults of the Hunker Democracy his thrusts were sometimes terrific, of which a striking example was given the year before, in meeting the brutal attacks of the pro-slavery press upon Silas Wright. An Albany journal completely outdid all its rivals in an atrocious assault written just after his sudden death, and without any knowledge of the fact. Referring to this, Van Buren said: "The blow which was aimed at the living statesman fell upon his new-made grave, and by an inscrutable providence his assassin was transformed into a jackal."

The effects of this campaign were most remarkable, and they show the power of a small and hated party to accomplish great and far-reaching results. General Taylor was elected, but his triumph proved the death of the Whig party. The long-coveted prize of the Presidency was snatched from General Cass, and the Democratic party was divided and humiliated by the struggle to serve two masters, while the friends of Van Buren had their longed-for revenge. The Free Soil ticket failed to carry the electoral vote of a single State, but the movement placed Chase in the United States Senate from Ohio, and sent to the lower branch of Congress a sufficient number of anti-slavery men to hold the balance of power in that body. It saved Oregon from the curse of slavery, with a territory nearly equal to that of the original thirteen States. It took the lead in the work of dedicating the public lands to actual settlement, which was finally consummated in 1862, and in compelling the admission of California into the Union as a free State; while it was the prophecy and parent of the larger movement which triumphed in 1860, and crowned itself with glory in suppressing the rebellion and giving freedom to the slave. These were great and magnificent achievements; and yet the members of the little party which stood behind them were then branded as fanatics for throwing away their votes!

But in awarding these honors to the Free Soil party, it should be frankly admitted that its leaders unwittingly did General Tay-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lor a great injustice in this campaign. His administration was not the hand-maid of slavery, nor was he the tool of any party or faction. Early in his official life he disclosed the fact that he had a mind of his own, and that the rule of his life was fidelity to his convictions. He set his face like flint against Clay's scheme of compromise, and confronted the great leaders of both parties, including his own son-in-law, Jefferson Davis, in maintaining his position. Taylor's plan of settlement in 1850 looked to the early admission of California and New Mexico as States, without executive or congressional intermeddling with their fortunes. He believed this policy would settle their condition in the interest of freedom. He thought California should be admitted at once, on its own merits, without being loaded down with a Texas boundary bill, a new fugitive-slave law, or any other legislative incumbrance. All attempts to intimidate or browbeat him were utterly vain, and when he suddenly died, in the summer of 1850, "Clay's Omnibus," as Professor Von Holst declares, "was left sticking in a swamp," where in all probability it would have remained if Taylor had lived, for he "never surrendered." The Free Soil members of Congress who had zealously opposed his election had become his best friends, and they were as gratified to find this Louisiana planter on the side of freedom and free labor as they were mortified after his death to find Fillmore, who had been elected as a Wilmot Proviso Whig from New York, takthe place of his predecessor and repudiating the liberal policy to which he had been so passionately devoted.

The campaign of 1852 is made memorable by the platforms then adopted by both the great parties. These platforms were the outcome of Clay's famous compromise of 1850, which abandoned the Wilmot Proviso and provided for the admission of additional States, with or without slavery, as their people might determine; enacted anew and very exasperating fugitive-slave law; extended the boundaries of Texas so as to add a vast area of free soil to slavery, and gave her ten millions of dollars besides; and enacted a law which pretended to abolish the slave trade in the District of Columbia, but did not. In the light of antecedent facts it is not surprising that these enactments were accepted by both parties as a "final settlement" of the slavery question. As to the Democrats, their experience in 1848 with General Cass and his Nicholson letter had convinced them that nothing was to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

be gained by mincing matters, and that a hearty, complete, and unhesitating surrender to the demands of their Southern brethren was the surest means of success. Accordingly, in their National Convention of the first of June, which nominated Pierce and King, they declared the fugitive-slave law to be equally sacred with the Constitution, and pledged the party to "resist all attempts at renewing in Congress, or out of it, the agitation of the slavery question, under whatever shape or color the attempt may be made." It was just as natural for the Whigs, after their surrender in 1848, to follow this example in their National Convention of the 16th of June, which nominated Scott and Graham. They accordingly expressed their acquiescence in the compromise acts of 1850 "as a final settlement, in principle and substance, of the subjects to which they relate"; and they deprecated "all further agitation of the questions thus settled as dangerous to our peace," and pledged the party "to discountenance all efforts to continue or renew such agitation, whenever, wherever, or however made." Here, indeed, was a real novelty in our politics. The sole issue in this campaign was slavery, and on this the rival parties were perfectly agreed. Their only strife was for the offices, and to this end each did its best to outdo the other in solemn asseverations of loyalty to the South. Both were not only willing, but anxious, to surrender the constitutional right of free speech in furtherance of party success, and this they proposed to do by reviving and applying to the whole people of the United States the gag rule of Atherton, of New Hampshire, which had been abrogated after a struggle of ten years under the heroic leadership of John Quincy Adams. The folly of this action is only equalled by its enormity, but its logic was unanswerable. If slavery was to be taken entirely out of politics and placed beyond the power of legislation it could only be done by totally suppressing free discussion. No wrong under the sun is secure while the right is regarded as sacred, and no one saw this more clearly than John C. Calhoun and his disciples. But they knew that it was as impossible to suppress the freedom of speech as to imprison the winds or stay the tides of the sea. The attempt of the Whigs and Democrats to do this was as futile as the Pope's bull against the comet, or Mrs. Partington's broom in mopping out the Atlantic. When these platforms were made *Uncle Tom's Cabin* was reaching the hearts of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

millions on both sides of the Atlantic, and playing its part in creating that public opinion of the civilized world which clearly foreshadowed the downfall of slavery. The tide of anti-slavery agitation was then nearing its flood, as shown by the numerous publications called forth by Mrs. Stowe's book, and the astonishing circulation of Sumner's great speech on the fugitive slave law. Agitation pervaded the common air. It found its way to the fireside and the social circle. It met the people at every turn. The very measures which the party platforms pronounced a finality gave it a sort of omnipresence, while the agitation of the party leaders themselves to *prevent* agitation only made still more ridiculous their attempt to silence it. And its suppression, if it had been possible, would have given us an absolute despotism in exchange for our free system of government.

In the light of to-day it seems utterly incredible that the events of this campaign could ever have happened. The conscience of the nation then touched its lowest point in the history of the Republic, if it did not reach the dead line; but many eminent men who in later years have rendered great and patriotic service to the country joined hands in this work of national humiliation. Mr. Seward scouted the idea of doing anything for the cause of freedom except through the Whig party, which in this very campaign dug the grave in which it was soon afterwards buried. Abraham Lincoln, who only six years later in his famous debate with Douglas, talked so eloquently about "a government half slave and half free," took the field on the platform which commanded silence on the only living issue of the time. All the great party leaders on both sides united in this unhallowed attempt to pacify their Southern brethren and eternize slavery, because their eyes were not yet anointed and they saw men as trees walking. But "the day is darkest before the dawn." Partly through the reaction which inevitably followed the madness of their measures, and partly through the teaching of events, the national conscience was resurrected, and a new heavens and a new earth appeared. Let no man despair of the Republic after such a trial and such a triumph.

The canvass of the Whigs in this struggle was utterly without heart or enthusiasm. Some of the Southern Whigs distrusted General Scott, while several of the Northern Whig leaders made themselves the laughing-stock of the country by their policy

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of "spitting upon the platform and swallowing the man who stood upon it." The Democrats were united. Notwithstanding their monstrous platform they succeeded in persuading the leading Barnburners of 1848 to return to the party and muster again in the army of slavery. General Dix, the Van Burens, David Dudley Field, Samuel J. Tilden, and one hundred thousand others in the State of New York alone, who had supported the Free Soil ticket of 1848, were now fighting for Pierce. They were not Free Soil men, but Van Buren men, who had been fighting for "liberty and revenge."

The Free Soil National Convention met at Pittsburgh on August 11, and nominated Hale and Julian. They adopted substantially the platform of 1848, with a few important additions. The party was then known as the Free Democracy, and the Convention declared that it was "not organized to aid either the Whig or Democratic wing of the great slave-compromise party of the nation, but to defeat them both; and that, repudiating and renouncing both as hopelessly corrupt and utterly unworthy of confidence, the purpose of the Free Democracy is to take possession of the Federal government and administer it for the rights and interests of the whole people."

The real enthusiasm of the campaign was in their ranks. They had no dream of success or even of carrying a single electoral vote; but they were profoundly in earnest, and united as one man. They really enjoyed the campaign, notwitstanding the smallness of their number, and the great odds against them. They had the courage of their opinions, and were animated by the enthusiasm of a great cause. The result of the canvass was a surprise to all parties. Pierce received 254 electoral votes, and Scott but 42, representing only four States of the Union. Hale received a little more than 156,000 votes, so that nineteen-twentieths of the voters of the United States in 1852, only a little more than ten years before Lincoln's preliminary proclamation of emancipation, voted for the finality and sacredness of the surrender made by Congress in 1850, and for the suppression of the freedom of speech as a means to that end; while only one-twentieth had the courage to claim their souls as their own. These were disheartening facts after a quarter of a century of anti-slavery agitation; for the deluded masses, who had been moulded and kneaded by the plastic touch of the South into such unworthy

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

uses were the only possible material from which recruits could be drawn for a great party of the future, which should regenerate our politics and re-enthrone the love of liberty. But the members of the little party never lost their faith. The mercenary and trading element, which had acted with them in 1848, was now eliminated, and no better or purer political organization ever existed. Its members felt perfectly sure of their triumph, because they knew that the unjust thing shall not prosper. And they made good their purpose to "take possession of the Federal government and administer it for the rights and interests of the whole people," for they were the nucleus and inspiration of the great movement which finally accomplished the work.

Of the Free Soil leaders of national repute in 1848 and 1852, one only survives. The names of these men, so familar to the public in their generation, are now rarely mentioned, but what they wrought endures. The question which so stirred their blood and kindled the wrath of their opponents has been lifted out of the tangle and jargon of debate into the clear light of accomplished facts. This is their sufficient reward, and will be their enduring renown. The lesson of their struggle and triumph is the inestimable value of political courage. They planted their feet upon the rock of principle and bided their time. If they had taken counsel of their fears and faltered in the face of a powerful and intolerant opposition, a divided union or a slave empire would have been the result. The same political courage is needed in dealing with the foreign and domestic policy of the government to-day, while the lack of it has brought upon the country its prolonged financial troubles and made the people afraid of their rulers. History is repeating itself. The present state of our politics recalls the tactics of 1852. Nothing is more to be deplored than the statesmanship which employs its time in finding out which way the wind blows and trimming its sails accordingly, instead of bravely appealing to fundamental principles as its never-failing guide.

GEORGE W. JULIAN.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CAN THE CRIMINAL BE RECLAIMED?

BY DR. H. S. WILLIAMS.

PROMINENT among the new "sciences" that have sprung up, mushroom-like, in our generation is "criminology." Its advocates regard the criminal as a distinct type of the *genus homo*. With the true spirit of our induction-haunted age, they analyze the delinquent out of all association with his fellows, making him stand apart as a separate order of being. This established to their own satisfaction, they are now searching for lesser subdivisions within the order. And so far has this analysis proceeded that already the criminologist is able to point out typical "murderers" who have never been accused of even attempting homicide, thus dividing the honors as to feats of classification with those other workers who some time since told us of typical "inebriates" who had never been intoxicated. The gist of the matter is that if your subject has the head and form of a certain mould he is a typical murderer potentially; whether he chances ever to live up to his potentialities is a matter of little moment. No doubt the abstract robber, forger, and what not, will follow in due season.

All this is very delightful if true. It suggests visions of a golden age, when science shall rule society and by its anticipatory action nip all crimes in the bud by restraining their would-be perpetrators. But with the vision comes also a doubt. One cannot help asking himself if the riddle of life is really so near a definite solution as all this would imply. Is the human mind so unified and invariable an entity that the initiated may read it as an open book; may not only interpret its present state but predict its future? One who looks into his own mind and sees what turmoil of tendencies is there would scarce have thought to read so tangibly the mind of another.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The matter becomes still more puzzling if we consider the question, What is a crime? For reflection seems to show that crime is not a thing *sui generis*, but merely the expression of a relation; the factors being on the one hand a certain human action, on the other a vague average status of human action at a given stage of evolution. A certain set of movements constituted the criminal act, but there was nothing intrinsically wrong in the movements. The act itself may not have been inherently wrong. It is the relation of that act to the rights of some other individual, directly or indirectly, that gave the stamp of criminality. Two persons are as essential to a crime as to a quarrel. Acts that militate against the interest of the agent only are called vices, not crimes. Again, deeds stamped as criminal under some circumstances are justified under others. Time was when might made right in the eyes of the most enlightened. Outrageous deeds had sanction of custom and the law among our primitive ancestors. And even now the outrage need only be done on a large enough scale to escape criticism. A highly civilized nation, acting as a unit, may swoop down upon a lesser nation and absorb it against its will without receiving the brand of robber. The deeds of individuals, too, are judged by a sliding scale. Many a man enjoys in honored security a fortune obtained by such means as would have gained him a home in the penitentiary had he taken hundreds instead of millions. Even so unequivocal a deed as the taking of human life is not intrinsically criminal according to our most advanced standards of thought. The soldier in battle has the lust of a veritable murderer, yet we do not call him by that name. And, under conditions of ordinary living, a man may take the life of another in self-defense and be held guiltless. Nor is accidental homicide, unless contributary carelessness is shown, regarded as a crime.

This last illustration suggests that even a consideration of a deed in its relations to the victim is not in itself enough to establish the ethical status of the deed. We must go a step further and inquire why the deed was committed. Unless the perpetrator of the deed acted intentionally, he is at most guilty of criminal carelessness. The assumption is that man is a rational animal; that there is a purpose—a desire—back of his every action. We hold him responsible only so long as he lives up to this assumption. The most ardent criminologist would not, I presume, as-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sert that his most typical criminal commits crime without a motive.

At this stage of the analysis, then, a crime would appear to be a deed by which one person expects to gain personal benefit at the expense of another person or persons. But the slightest reflection shows that this formula is not exact. It is inclusive, but it is not exclusive. The expectation of personal benefit is the great ruling motive back of nearly every human action; indeed it is in the last analysis the sole fundamental motive to action in the organic world. Hence there is nothing unique or characteristic in this feature of the criminal action, by itself. And undoubtedly a large number of human actions that are considered legitimate and not criminal benefit the actor at the expense of his fellows. For example, the speculations by which most of the large fortunes of civilized countries are made belong largely to this category. Evidently some element that enters into the essential nature of a crime has yet escaped us. And this essential element is the consideration of the kind or degree of injury that is inflicted on the victim of the crime. The words crime and sin are not synonymous. Sinfulness is fixed in accordance with an absolute standard of ethics, criminality in accordance with a relative or human standard. And as the social organism is steadily evolving, its standard of ethics is constantly changing; hence the boundaries of criminal action are forever fluctuating. An accurate descriptive definition of crime therefore becomes impossible. We may modify the partial definition already given by saying that a crime is an act by which one person expects to gain personal benefit at such expense to another person or persons as society at the moment considers inequitable. But this is only a circumlocution of that practical definition of crime as a wilful violation of human law, which proposition is perhaps as near a satisfactory definition as we can hope to come to. If we understand that the laws in question have been framed to represent the average ethical standards of the social organism at a given time, this definition is sufficiently comprehensive.

In view of the fact that we have seen the motive to crime to be a natural and rational one, the essential question in reference to the causation of crime is not why some persons commit crimes, but why all persons do not commit crimes. It is a matter of common experience that every one has desires that if carried out

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

would criminally infringe the rights of others. Why are such desires in any given case repressed? There can be but one reason: these desires are subordinated and overcome by other antagonistic desires. Desire is the motive power back of all human action; and most complicated actions are brought about only after a variety of conflicting desires have been weighed and considered. The higher desires which, being weighed and considered, overcome our criminal desires, are the outgrowth of the gregarious habits of our race. So long as each family existed by and for itself alone, the ethics of pure egoism must have prevailed. But when the desirability of communal life for mutual protection, and of division of labor for mutual advantage, had become apparent, it must have been equally apparent that these things were not compatible with pure egoism. The spirit of practical altruism was born, and the cornerstone of civilization was laid. But this altruistic spirit merely meant, after all, that each individual would consult his own ultimate interest if he sometimes put aside his immediate desires in favor of the desires of others. For example, the barbarian starting out on a hunting expedition sees a very fine bow hanging in front of his neighbor's tent, and strongly desires to possess it. He starts to take it; but at once reflects that by so doing he will incur the wrath of the neighbor, who will come forth and in all probability kill him. He desires to live more than to possess the bow; so the immediate desire is put aside. Such acts of self-denial, being manifestly in the interests of communal advancement, come finally to have the sanction of the race; they are then said to be right, the opposite acts to be wrong. In time, another motive than fear of the injured one's wrath comes to be operative in restraining the immediate impulse of the citizen: he fears the disapprobation of all his fellow-citizens, and covets their approval, and the desire for the latter comes finally to be stronger than the desire for his neighbor's property. But the individual mind always reflects in large measure the aggregate mind, and presently the man who through self-denial has secured the approval of the community comes to take pleasure in his own approval. To do the altruistic thing, even when his neighbors do not know of it, gives him satisfaction, because he feels that he would have the approval of the community if his deed were known. And this egotistic sense of satisfaction becomes in time the full-fledged monitor, conscience. How elaborated and dif-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ferentiated it becomes in an advanced civilization, how far its general basal outlines are obscured, needs no comment; but always in its essence it is in the highest man, as in the lowest, merely an approving consciousness within, representing the sentiment which the individual believes would be voiced by the average mind of his race, could that average intelligence pass judgment on his action. That conscience in the last analysis stands for this and nothing more than this, will not, I apprehend, be disputed. It follows that conscience is purely a matter of education, and that its promptings will represent, at any stage of evolution, merely the average social sentiment of that period. Thus the partially civilized man, whose conscience tells him it would be wrong to surreptitiously take his neighbor's bow, will not hesitate a moment to take the bow of a member of another tribe than his own, and will even, if he can do so, slip into the tent and kill the owner himself, returning with an approving conscience to meet the approbation and glorification of all his fellow-citizens. His conscience tells him of right and wrong, but it is right and wrong only in a very restricted sense; questions of absolute ethics have no place in his mind, nor in the minds of his fellows.

I suppose if one were to affirm that the average society of our best civilizations has not advanced as yet much beyond this plane of relative or utilitarian altruism, he would be cried down as a pessimist. Nevetheless one feels forced to venture such an opinion, protesting meantime, however, that he is unreservedly optimistic. But to avoid a controversial attitude, one may waive this point, and claim merely that this utilitarian altruism is the philosophy of a large minority of the race. Such a contention will answer just as well for the present purpose. All will agree that there is a large class in every community whose standards of right and wrong are strictly utilitarian. Whatever they can secure without being detected is fair booty to these unevolved beings. They regard laws not as representing the average ethical status of their race—such terms having no meaning for them—but as strictly arbitrary human pronunciamentos which are to be evaded if possible, obeyed only if unavoidable. These persons will act always on the nearest desire, unless they fear to do so, or unless a more remote desire gives perfectly tangible promise of greater direct personal benefit. They will steal a hat, for example, unless restrained by the fear of detection, or by the belief that in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

waiting they stand a good chance of being able to purloin a coat instead. We say of such persons that they have no moral sense, though the statement is not strictly accurate. They are otherwise known as habitual criminals.

"But," it will perhaps be said, "these are exactly the contentions of the criminologists whom you have all along professed to antagonize." Thus far, precisely; but the difference comes now: for the crimnologist holds that these criminals have failed to evolve because their brains were inherently defective. I contend that in the great majority of cases they have failed to evolve because they were human and could not rise far above their environment. I have contended that there are good tendencies as well as bad in everybody, and that the two extremes of the social scale are not *inherently* so very far apart in a moral way. But it is conceded that the conscience—the moral sense—reflects the individual environment. It will further be conceded without argument that the time of plasticity during which conscience is forming is the childhood and adolescent period of the individual. Now, what is the environment in which these habitual criminals are usually reared? Why, an environment of crime. Jeers and curses are the first sounds to greet the infant's ears. By example, if not by precept, it is taught that the object of living is to secure as much as possible from one's fellows with the least possible return; that sin consists in being found out; that a successful and undetected crime is the most laudable of acts. Wax to receive, marble to retain, that young mind was graven deep with the lines of wrong living. A subtle poison permeated every cell of its body; what wonder if it thenceforth gave out none but poisoned thoughts? It were contrary to all experience to expect it to do otherwise, for the environment which counts in moulding us is that with which we come in immediate contact during the formative period of life. The highest thought, the most elevated morals, of any generation are, in a sense, the hot-house cultures of that generation. Just in proportion as they rise above the average understanding and morality of the time, they tend to become unstable. The lower, the more primitive, instincts lie deeper in the grain of the organism. Left to itself, the organism will revert to them as surely as the hot-house plant run wild reverts to its primitive forms. In the one case just as much as in the other, careful training is necessary if the best result is to be obtained.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The flowers of the human mind do not bloom on human weeds.

All education, physical, mental, or moral, is primarily a cultivation of powers of resistance. Incessant attacks are being made upon the organism by environing forces. Disease germs, inclemencies of weather, noxious gases, wage warfare. If the organism cannot repel these it becomes physically diseased. Cares, anxieties, business and social difficulties, worriments, prey on the mind; if they are not repelled, insanity results. Natural appetites, long inherent propensities whose gratification is no longer consistent with the existing standards of society, offer alluring temptations; if these are not resisted, crime is the result. The resistant physical being maintains physical health; the resistant mental being maintains sanity; the resistant moral being maintains a high ethical status, so long as the strain put upon it is not too severe. But the most resistant organism, physical, mental, or moral, has its yielding point. Some can stand more strain, some less, but none is absolutely unyielding; the strongest bridge can bear only a given weight. But manifestly we may guard against breakdown in two radically different ways; we may strengthen the organism or we may lessen the strain that is put upon it. We guard against physical disease by building up the tissues and selecting a healthful environment. We guard against mental disease by educating the mind and by avoiding pursuits that bring intellectual strain. We may guard against crime by developing the higher ethical sense, and by removing temptations to wrong living. How to do this best is the problem of practical sociology.

If this view is correct, the criminal differs from his fellows not so much in inherent depraved tendencies as in defective powers of resistance. The law-abiding individual has or has had many of the same propensities that are patent in the criminal, but they have been corrected, repressed, or even eradicated by the cultivation of higher instincts; that is, by ethical development. The great practical question is: To what extent is a similar cultivation possible in the ranks from which habitual criminals are recruited? In reply, I assert, despite the dictum of the criminologist, that there is no known fact to disprove the belief that a considerable degree of such development is always possible; while abundant data are at hand to prove that a marvelous—

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a revolutionizing—degree of such development is often practicable. If the child of criminal parents is allowed to grow up under the tutorage of those parents and their associates, it will be a criminal almost as a matter of course. There is no need to invoke heredity to explain such a case. But there is every reason to believe that the same child placed amid different surroundings would have grown to a far different maturity. It may be said that since the two experiments can never be tried with the same child, and since no two children are precisely alike, the matter can never be brought to a demonstration; but, fortunately, as the matter stands, it has been brought near enough a demonstration to convince any candid person. I do not here refer to the thousands of children who are rescued each year from the slums of cities, and brought up in institutions from which they finally go out into the world as useful, ethical citizens; for plainly the objection just noted applies to every one of these, though even here the results reach a moral certainty. I refer to cases in which the rescue is made after the individual criminal bent has been established and put in practice. Fortunately there are statistics at hand that prove that even after the plastic period of childhood has been spent in the haunts of vice, after the lower instincts have for a time had full sway, much may still be done in many cases to develop the higher ethical sense upon which depends the resistant power that shall shield from crime. I refer to the records of those institutions of which the Reformatory at Elmira, N. Y., is the forerunner and the type in this country.

There is no more cheering message anywhere for the optimist than the history of this institution as epitomized in its last annual report. It appears, fortunately for the present purpose, that the persons admitted there are tested as to their ethical sense on admission, and the startling result is announced that of "moral sense, even such as shown under examination, either filial affection, sense of shame or personal loss," almost 40 per cent. have "absolutely none," and 31 per cent. more, "possibly some." Inquiry being made as to the heredity of these persons, it is found to average of the very worst, insanity or epilepsy being traced in the ancestry of 12 per cent. of cases, and drunkenness "clearly traced" in 38 per cent., "doubtful" in 13 per cent. more. The ancestors were "without any educa-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion" or could "simply read and write" in 44 per cent. of admissions.

Here, then, if we went no further, would appear to be most conclusive proof of the overmastering power of heredity, justifying the worst prognostications of the alarmists. But there is another side to the story. These "moral imbeciles" have not only inherited bad tendencies, but they have been reared in such a way as fostered the very worst of them. The character of the homes from which they come is said to be "positively bad" in 54 per cent. of cases, and "fair only" in 38 per cent more. The "character of associations" was thought to be "positively bad" in 55 per cent. of cases, and "not good" in 42 per cent. more. The age on admission of these inmates varies from sixteen to thirty years, 43 per cent. being over twenty. Yet of the entire number 19 per cent. were absolutely illiterate, and 48 per cent. more could "simply read and write with difficulty." That this deficiency is due to lack of opportunity rather than to inherent deficiency is shown by the fact that only 1.4 per cent. are considered as mentally deficient, 71 per cent. being of "good" natural capacity, and nearly 9 per cent. more of "excellent" capacity.

These statistics show the matter in another, and, as the sequel proves, a truer light. For the first time in their lives these moral imbeciles are placed in a healthful environment. The result is startling. Dormant tendencies for good, now for the first time given opportunity, blossom out surprisingly, and in a few months we see many of these moral imbeciles discussing ethical questions involving an acute moral sense. Mental and physical training goes hand in hand with the moral, and in due time about eighty per cent. of the prisoners sent there with indeterminate sentences are returned to the outer world, and observation shows that about four-fifths of these become honest bread-winners permanently. More than 2,500 have thus been rescued at this one institution in the past seventeen years, and among these, beyond question, were hundreds that the criminologist would have pronounced hopeless natural criminals. Doubtless there are many respectable citizens of to-day who might when they went to the Reformatory have sat for the criminologist's picture of a "typical murderer."

There is, I say, no more cheering message for the optimist than

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

this record of the practical salvation of 2,500 souls. And when we reflect that bad habits spread by contagion, and that each of these reformed individuals would have become, if left to himself, a focus for the diffusion of criminal ideas, the full import of the message is seen to be far greater than the bare figures indicate. When each penal institution in the land has come to be such an ethical factor as this, instead of a nursery of crime, as most of them are to-day, the records of criminology will tell a very different story from the doleful one they now present.

If so much can be accomplished with individuals that have developed far on wrong lines before being taken in hand, what may we not expect from younger subjects? The period of development, and hence of plasticity, in the human species is a long one, but the time of greatest plasticity is the period of infancy and childhood. If the influences that are applied then are bad, the task of supplanting them with good tendencies later on becomes doubly difficult, and there comes a time in the history of every individual when the mind, as it were, crystallizes, and can no longer be moulded. This period comes earlier in some individuals, later in others, but it is almost sure to come to all before maturity. A striking analogy in illustration of this may be drawn from lower forms of life. It is well known that the queen bee (the mature female) is developed by a process of forced feeding from a larva that under ordinary circumstances would have produced only a common "worker." Of the thousands of larvæ in the hive, all have the same parentage, and hence precisely the same hereditary tendencies. Every one has the potentialities of a queen, but only in the single one selected by the feeders will these possibilities be realized. A more striking illustration of the power of environment over heredity could not be desired. But in the present connection it is especially to be noted that the higher development can be accomplished only if begun during the infancy of the individual. After the larva has passed a certain stage, no amount of forced feeding will avail to develop it beyond the station of a worker.

The same lesson is enforced by consideration of higher animals. It is familiar knowledge that most wild beasts can be tamed only if taken while young, but that then many of the wildest and fiercest become perfectly tame and tractable. Birds, because of their very rapid development, furnish most con-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

spicuous illustrations of the transition from a plastic to what I have just termed a crystallized condition of mind. It is said that young wild ducks when they first come from the shell have no fear whatever of a human intruder, but will nestle contentedly in his hand. But after a few hours of maternal tutorage they become so timid and shy that it is almost impossible to capture them, and if taken they show extreme terror of the being that a few hours before did not at all alarm them. Birds that pass their earlier childhood in a nest do not develop quite so rapidly, but undergo the same transition. A young crow, if taken from the nest during the first week or ten days of its life, becomes the most confiding and amusing of pets, seeming to regard men as beings of its own kind. If a few days later on another nestling is taken, this one also will become domesticated, but it will never be tame and confiding as the first; it will have something of the suspicious nature of a wild crow. Yet another week or ten days, and the remaining nestlings are able to fly about with their parents and have become altogether irreclaimable. No amount of training will ever suffice to tame them. They are "natural, inherent, hereditary" barbarians, apparently; but the tame brother, which, if taken to the woods and placed with its fellows, will fly back to the city and seek out its master in preference to crow companions, is a living illustration that a factor other than heredity has been overlooked in such a verdict. I once had a tame crow that followed me often into the field when I went hunting, and have had it sit on my shoulder—or perhaps on the gun barrel—and caw a welcome to wild crows that flew by, with apparently no more thought of leaving me than my hunting dog had of turning wolf. One might almost rest the case for environment on the evidence of such a single case.

Nor is there anything far-fetched in drawing illustrations from lower forms of life to apply to man. The day is past when it was supposed that the human mind is intrinsically different in kind from other minds. It is now known that general biological truths apply to each and every member of the organic scale from highest to lowest. The details of application are varied with each species, but the fundamental outlines are the same in all. And in this connection it may not be amiss to note that the human family contains but a single species.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

We need not—indeed we cannot—overlook heredity; but in the light of all these facts is it not wiser to regard each individual vicious little John Doe as the victim of undevelopment, and hence to strive to educate him to a better point of view, than to label him "hereditary criminal" and leave him to the hard fate fortune has originally dealt him? Practical humanitarians have long since answered this question in the affirmative. They have rescued thousands on thousands of little Does from the surroundings of vice, and developed them into useful citizens. The task is not always easy. Even at the age of five or six years a child has imbibed a host of the ideas that are current in its environment, and these early ideas tend to cling. It may require long and patient training before they can be supplanted. But the teacher who, given full sway, remembers the biological truth that individual development must be an epitome of racial evolution, will almost surely succeed in time with the subject who has not progressed too far in the wrong direction. As the racial conscience —as evidenced in its systems of ethics—has developed along the lines of fear of punishment and love of approbation to a final altruism; so the individual conscience must be stimulated along these same lines. Gradually, as the mental horizon of the little "moral imbecile" widens, he comes to see the advantages of substituting future welfare for present desire, and when there dawns upon him the consciousness that he is a factor in the body politic, and that his own ultimate good is coincident with the public weal, his future is practically assured. He has passed from the realm of the criminologist, has ceased to be a natural, hereditary criminal, and has entered the ranks of law-abiding citizens. Still being human, he is not invincible. He is not removed from the possibility of crime. But he has acquired an average power of resistance to the temptations of a normal environment, whereas untrained he would have been their ready victim.

H. S. Williams.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NATURAL BIMETALLISM.

BY GEORGE H. LEPPER.

It is scarcely possible that the November elections will result in giving to either of the chief parties to the silver issue the control of all branches of the National Legislature. On the contrary, it seems to be a foregone conclusion that the House and the Senate will be more widely apart than at present on the chief question of the day, and that no legislation on the subject can reach the President so long as the lines remain as now drawn. Such a result would be a victory for the "sound-money" party, inasmuch as no legislation would signify a retention of the gold standard. But this victory is greatly qualified by the fact that some sort of a relief measure has become imperative, and no measure of this character, short of a full recognition of free coinage of silver, will be countenanced by the Senate.

Under these circumstances the horizon shows no sign of breaking clouds. Should the conservatives prevail, what ground have we for hoping that they will succeed better than in the past in the safe and statesmanlike conduct of our financial affairs? On the other hand, should free coinage at the ratio of 16 to 1 win the day, what can we expect from a theory which holds that arithmetic is a proper subject for legislation—that one dollar can be legislated into two others of equal value?

There remains the plan of securing the co-operation of foreign powers for the establishment of a fixed ratio of coinage between the metals. I cannot understand how anyone who has watched the history of the efforts already made toward this object can manage to retain faith in its early realization. We cannot wait much longer. Nor is it any less puzzling how any European power, or union of powers, can see any advantage to itself in such co-operation with us, in view of the possibility of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

our resorting to a silver basis and throwing free our store of gold, for which they are secretly longing. By exchanging their present surplus of silver for double its value of our gold, it is easy to see that gold monometallism would shortly become the only practicable basis for all the European nations, and that the death-blow to international bimetallism had fallen.

When matters have arrived at such a crisis in our affairs as this, it is plain that we have missed the true path, and that we must go back to the beginning for a fresh start.

Let us forget all we know, or suppose we know, about money, and fancy ourselves at the foundation of society, and about to take the first step in the creation of metallic currency. We will suppose gold to be chosen for this purpose, that a certain weight of definite fineness of the metal is agreed upon as a standard of value, and that that standard is called a dollar. In the course of time the advantage of paper currency, based upon the gold of the government, is realized and embraced. The nation becomes involved in war, and bonds issue to provide the means necessary for its conduct. Later it develops that gold, being limited in quantity by nature, and insufficient for our needs, some other substance must be employed along with it, and for good reasons silver is chosen. Here we come face to face with the problem of to-day, but let us work it out naturally. If silver is to aid gold as a basis for our monetary system, it must serve the same purposes, and be accorded the same rights. Of these rights, certainly coinage—unlimited coinage—is the chief. How would this naturally be done? The first query to arise would be, what is the market price of silver? or, how much silver can a gold dollar buy? This being satisfactorily answered, the government must be considered as saying to its citizens and, indeed, to all the world, as it has already said in the case of gold, that it will accept at its various mints or other designated places, all the silver that may be offered, and give in exchange therefor its notes to the amount of as many dollars as the silver at the time is worth in gold dollars. This is an equitable transaction. The following day it is found that silver has increased in value. If the government refuses to follow the commercial ratio, no silver will be offered. The third day silver has fallen below the first day's price. Upon what rule of business, equity, or common sense should the government be

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

obliged to purchase at the higher price, when it can get all it requires at a lower one? The logic of all this is, that silver shall be monetized at the market price or not at all. Such is the case with gold to-day. Such will always be the case with gold, for an abundance of it will be reflected in the lower price of products, and a scarcity in the higher price of the same products. It is so reflected in the price of silver. What is here said of gold can with equal truth be predicted of all other products. The chief reason why gold is chosen as a standard is, that it is limited in quantity by nature, and therefore cannot be produced to the extent of destroying its fitness for that purpose. The same remark applies to silver, but not in equal degree, consequently it is impossible to establish a ratio of fixed weights between them which shall constantly preserve equivalence in values.

Even admitting, for the sake of argument, that this is at present possible, it cannot be denied that the discovery of fabulous mines of one or the other of the metals may occur at any time that would effectually destroy the ratio we may have fixed, and compel the adoption of a new one. Assuredly the only safe and sensible course is to monetize silver at its market rate from day to day, in which case no such contingency as suggested could arise.

The question is, how can this be done? Very easily and simply. It will be admitted at once that the market rate of to-day can be determined. Begin with that rate, and the fact that a great government like our own has, by a close investigation of the matter, found such to be the rate, and that it has adopted it in its own operations, will serve, within a narrow margin, to maintain it for a long period. Should either metal be found to increase in production to an extent to disturb this rate, the government, not being committed to that particular ratio, may follow the market like any other financial concern, and constantly exact *quid pro quo*.

Upon receipt of the silver bullion at the places which may be designated for the purpose, let the silver be duly weighed and assayed in order to determine its value in gold at the current market rate. Let this silver, then, be fashioned into bars of fixed weight (not values or money) and stored in our treasuries or sub-treasuries, and let the customer be given in return notes for as many dollars as the silver has been found to be worth, and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

make those notes legal tender. These notes must be redeemable at any future time, not in the exact quantity of silver in exchange for which they were issued, but in a *dollar's worth* of silver, whatever may be the current rate at the time of such redemption. But more than this. We are now creating money, and we have gold and silver both as a joint basis for our monetary system; consequently we must make these notes redeemable as well in standard gold coin, dollar for dollar.

Now I contend that all money issued by the government should be and must be redeemable in one and the same manner, if it is to maintain parity of value. For this reason all the money of the government outstanding—silver, gold, or paper—shall be likewise redeemable in the same manner as the notes I have described, or be convertible into such notes. Gold brought for coinage should be treated in like manner as the silver, and should be redeemable either in gold or in the equivalent of that gold in silver. The principle should be extended also to our bonds, which, being payable in "coin," offer no obstacle to payment in this manner.

The underlying fallacy in all previous efforts to solve this question has been in the assumption that because the gold standard is of fixed weight silver should be treated in like manner. We are now concerned with *values*, and the gold dollar is no more a standard of weight for measuring the value of silver than for measuring that of wheat or any other commodity.

Let me summarize the three principles fundamental to my theory of *true* or *natural* bimetallism, and then leave the reader to apply the theory to the difficulties he has encountered in his own cogitations upon the subject. I am confident he will find that it will answer every requirement of the problem to which it applies. These principles are:

First. That one standard only is conceivable in thought, or possible in practice.

Second. That the market value must control in the coinage of the companion metal.

Third. That all obligations of the government, present and future, reading in dollars, shall be paid or redeemed, at the option of the government, either in standard gold coin, or in so much silver as shall on the day of redemption be equivalent thereto at the general market rate.

GEORGE H. LEPPER.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NOVELS WITHOUT A PURPOSE.

BY GRANT ALLEN.

THE nineteenth century has tolerated to some extent that inartistic and jejune gaud, the novel without a purpose: the twentieth century, holding higher and truer conceptions of art, will soon outgrow it.

I am well aware that to many readers at the present day this forecast will sound like a wild paradox. It is the novel *with* a purpose that they have heard decried as puerile and inartistic. But what *is* a paradox? In nine cases out of ten, is it not the bold statement of an obvious but neglected truth, too long obscured by blatant iteration of a clamorous falsehood? Now, in this matter of the object and function of fiction, a certain dominant (though retrogressive and obscurantist) school of critics has for some twenty years been dinning into our ears a dogma wholly alien to the real tendencies which this age has displayed for at least a century. It has been preaching and vociferating its poor little formula of "Art for Art's sake," in season and out of season, till most people at last have almost begun to believe it for its much speaking. It has essayed to convince us that the childish desire for a story which is no more than a story ought somehow to rank above the adult preference for a story which points a moral, besides adorning a tale. And it has done this in spite of the patent fact that all the most successful novels of the last half century, from *Uncle Tom's Cabin* to *Jude the Obscure*, have been novels *with* a purpose; that the tendency to write and to read such novels with a purpose has steadily increased throughout the whole of this period; and that the purpose itself has become with each decade more and more important, relatively to the mere infantile pleasure of telling or hearing a story of adventure. In short, our critics have set out with a false theory

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of art, and then have attempted to twist plain facts into accordance with their theory.

In opposition to this obsolescent school of criticism I wish to show here two things: first, that as a matter of fact the tendency of the higher fiction, from beginning to end, has been all in the direction of a constantly deeper and more plainly avowed purpose; and second, that as a matter of principle the highest and truest art is and must be the art with a purpose. And I shall further suggest as a corollary the conclusion that the twentieth century—presumably one in which the ethical impulse will have even a stronger hold than it has had in the nineteenth—is likely to demand a still larger amount of purpose in its art, and a deeper conception of what purpose is adequate.

I begin with the matter of fact. I think it undeniable, to anybody who examines as a whole the fiction of the nineteenth century, compared with that of the eighteenth, that the ethical element in the newer work far outweighs that in the older. In England, especially, most of the fiction of the Georgian period precisely mirrors the essentially unprogressive thought of the epoch in which it was produced. It is either decorously dull and conventional, like Richardson; or else boisterously vulgar and human, like Fielding. It lacks inner meaning. True, in certain of its outcomes, such as *Clarissa Harlowe*, an attempt is made at a certain impression of a supposed moral lesson; but this moral lesson is almost always trite and commonplace—a lesson of the most trivial copybook order: "Be virtuous as your grandmother understood virtue!" It marks no advance in the ethical thought of the race; it is statical, like *Adam Bede*, not dynamical, like Rousseau, Shelley, Tolstoi, Ibsen. In this half-and-half category, I would place those eighteenth-century works, such as *The Vicar of Wakefield*, or *Pamela*, or even *Paul et Virginie*, in whose pages the accepted code of morals is enforced and accentuated by means of a story whose main interest depends upon its character and incident, or its descriptive passages, not on its position as marking progress for humanity. The literature of the eighteenth century in England knows nothing of *problems*.

In France, the impulses which went to make up the nineteenth century awoke and realized themselves earlier than elsewhere. Therefore it is in France that we find the novel with a purpose already becoming a weapon of progressive thought in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the powerful hands of Voltaire and Rousseau. This it is, I think, which gives to such sketches as *Candide* and the *Nouvelle Héloïse* their universal and lasting value. Outside England and English-speaking America, how many people know anything of *Tom Jones* or of *Sir Charles Grandison?* But all the world, from St. Petersburg to Lima, knows Voltaire, Rousseau, Diderot. And why? Because these French thinkers (oh! yes, I know that Rousseau was Swiss)—these French thinkers represent a moment in the development of human thought; they mark time for the race; what they had to say was new and interesting in all countries equally. The nineteenth century had its precursors in the eighteenth, especially in France, and it is those precursors who speak to us still with most world-wide authority.

In England, the novel with a purpose began its course feebly with *Sandford and Merton* and Miss Edgeworth's stories. I acknowledge that these examples are damaging to my cause; but I have confidence enough in my case to expose them frankly to the barbed shaft of the enemy. During the early half of the present century, the movement towards purposive fiction did not make much headway either in Britain or America. Its place was taken, as we shall see a little later, by the purposive poetry of Shelley, Keats, and Wordsworth. Godwin's *Caleb Williams,* however, is an example to the contrary; and so are a few others like the curious romances of Thomas Love Peacock. Yet on the whole, it must be confessed, the essentially reactionary Romanticist school, represented early by Byron, Scott, and Châteaubriand, later by Bulwer Lytton, Victor Hugo, and Tennyson (I am speaking very broadly) carried the day for awhile both in England and France as against the newer purposive and ethical literature heralded by Shelley. It is noteworthy that the dogma of "Art for Art's sake" derives its origin from this romantic school —from Gautier and Baudelaire: it is, in fact, a legacy of the reaction of Waterloo and the evil days before 1830.

As the nineteenth century progressed, however, it became abundantly clear that the novel without a purpose was ceasing to engage the best intellects of the nations. Gradually fiction began to think and to teach, instead of merely amusing. In England Charlotte Brontë, that double-dyed Celt—half Irish, half Cornish—raised the true Celtic dragon-standard of revolt in *Jane Eyre* and elsewhere. The purpose as yet was not indeed obtru-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sive; but it was there undeniably, and it had germinal value; it set people thinking. The function of the Celt in literature, indeed, is always the same. "Have ye a government?" he asks. "Thin I'm agin it." He is the preacher of upheaval. The popular novelists of the mid-century, it is true—Thackeray, Dickens, Trollope—did not try to think, or to make others think, either. They were content with mere passive delineation of character. But while they were in the zenith of their fame, a new and revolutionary school, beginning with the Brontës, was slowly working its way upward into favor. George Eliot *did* think, though in a formless way, and often with strangely reactionary results; her whole literary work seemed to those who knew her like a deliberate contradiction of the aspirations for freedom in her life and conduct; it is wonderful how a woman, who felt and acted as she did, could have stooped to write novels so unworthy of her place as a pioneer in the movement for the emancipation of women. George Meredith also dates back his beginnings to this formative period; and anyone who follows him from *The Shaving of Shagpat* and *The Ordeal of Richard Feverel* down to *Diana of the Crossways, One of Our Conquerors,* and *Lord Ormont and his Aminta,* cannot fail to observe the constant growth in importance of the underlying purpose. Nor is it immaterial to observe that the same world which devoured *The Newcomes* and *Nicholas Nickleby* took little note at the time of Meredith's masterpieces.

The last decade or two in particular have given us increasing proof of the growth in popularity of the novel with a purpose, and the consequent relegation of the novel without a purpose to its proper place—the school-room or the nursery. We have been overwhelmed by stories like Mrs. Humphry Ward's—instinct with moral lessons. Now, I do not for a moment mean to imply that Mrs. Humphry Ward's moral lessons commend themselves to my soul. The popularity of *Robert Elsmere* is a marvel to those who had outgrown Robert Elsmerism before they were born; while the popularity of *David Grieve,* a smug exhibition of the British sense of moral superiority to those vicious Continentals, is an insult to the ethical tone of France and of enlightened England. Still, the fact remains that these essentially purposive books, be they good, bad, or mediocre, have attained an enormous circulation in our own time, and have done so mainly on the strength of their purposes. Another similar instance was

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that ponderous *John Inglesant.* Later still, the chief successes of the decade have been made by *The Heavenly Twins, The Yellow Aster, Keynotes, Tess,* and a dozen more equally purposive stories. Miss Marie Corelli and Edna Lyall, each in her own way, illustrate the same tendency. Even *Trilby* owes part at least of its singular popularity to what it may contain of widening and expanding power—it is largely accepted as a covert protest against prevalent English and American Puritanism.

If one sets against these distinctly purposive successes the success of such other writers as Rider Haggard, Anthony Hope, Stanley Weyman, and Conan Doyle, it will be clear, I think, that the former class as a whole mark the taste of adult men and women, of the more thoughtful and progressive, of the makers and moulders of the coming century; while the latter class as a whole mark the taste of boys and girls and casual readers, of the survivors from the past, of the conservative and reactionary as against the progressive and ascending element. I do not mean that Doyle and Weyman have not done admirable work of its kind; I merely mean that their work (as a rule) does not aim at the highest audience. (Even this is not true of Doyle's work in all cases.) Books, on the other hand, like Hardy's *Tess* and *Jude,* like Olive Schreiner's *Story of an African Farm,* strike the keynote of our century. They are instinct with our hopes, our fears, our problems. They could not have been written in any age save this; while *She* and *A Gentleman of France* might almost equally have stepped out of some other century. I do not deny, of course, that the romantic temperament and the love for books of adventure (especially among the young) will always live on; but I believe that side by side with these the taste for books of thought and ethical teaching will always increase, and in an accelerated ratio. I think men and women will less and less be content, like children, with mere hearing of a story; they will demand from their novelists something that at the same time instructs and elevates them.

"But where do you put Stevenson in this gallery of recent writers?" Ah, Stevenson is—Stevenson. A great artist in his way—perhaps even more of an artist in fibre than Meredith and Hardy, though less of a thinker—he was an artist alone, and little beyond it. He had his ideas, it is true, his *aperçus,* his rebellions, his fancies; and those who can look an inch below the surface may

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

often read them. Yet, on the whole, I am prepared to give Stevenson over as a free gift to the enemy—to treat him rather as a survivor from the early nineteenth than as a precursor and herald of the twentieth century. He was a semi-barbaric Scandinavian-Celt of the Western Islands, at home at Skerryvore, among the foam of the Atlantic. His boyishness, indeed, with its natural concomitant in love of adventure, was one of his most charming and lovable characteristics. Great craftsman of words as he was, he never quite grew up; he loved to sleep out in a sack in the Cevennes, to canoe on French rivers, to fraternize with Samoans on the beach of Falesá; and the childish side in him endeared him to all of us. But I cannot help thinking the adult and virile temperament of Meredith, the adult and civilized temperament of Hardy, is higher and deeper than the untamable boyishness and delicious waywardness of the hermit of Samoa.

Kipling again? Well, Kipling is undoubtedly a real force in our literature, a typical embodiment of the bulldog instincts of the Englishman. But he stands somewhat aside from either of the main currents of the day. Nor do I desire to class all writers as better or worse, simply in so far as they happen to represent or not to represent purpose in fiction. Nevertheless, I would say that, in a wider sense, Kipling too is purposive. His aim is exegetical. He does not merely put before us vivid and graphic pictures of Anglo-Indian society, of the jungle world, of military or seafaring life, of the East End of London. He has a mission of his own, in a globe that is daily becoming more and more complex. It is the mission of interpretation. He set out to a great extent as the literary exponent of the Romance of the Clash of Races. Our planet is daily shrinking—and also expanding. Shrinking as regards distances, and the time taken to traverse them; expanding as regards the number of nations, races, creeds, and moral codes which the average citizen now begins to cognize or to come in contact with. East and West have joined hands; Egypt, Japan, South Africa are part of us. Kipling has made himself, on one side of his work, the laureate of the resulting strife and intermixture. In this direction, many other writers of the day may be fairly classed with him—Stevenson in his Pacific stories; Rider Haggard in his wild South African tales; Hall Caine in his Morocco romance; Gilbert Parker in his admirable Canadian episodes. I am not here class-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing these writers together, of course, as regards literary merit; their planes are various; I am merely huddling them into the same rough category as exponents, each on his own plane, of the cosmopolitan ideas necessarily engendered by an age of rapid European and American expansion. For to make us grasp in its totality the vast and varied world in which we live and move and have our being is surely in itself an adequate purpose.

Closely allied with this group of quasi-purposive authors, whose vogue shows at least the interest felt by the general reading public in the wider world around them, I would place the other and overlapping or partially coincident group of authors who deal with outlying factors or minor elements in our own more domestic western civilization. Time was when English and American fiction dealt mainly with the ladies and gentlemen of England, the cultured New Englanders, the polite society of New York or Philadelphia; if more than that, then at best it concerned itself with the farmers of the Midland Counties, the rough Yorkshire moorlanders, the miners of the Western States, the grangers of the prairies. But nowadays, that intense desire of half the world to know how the other half lives has produced a new type and crop of fiction. We want to hear of kings and tinkers. Thrums and Donegal have begun to find voice. Tommy Atkins himself is no longer mute. Zangwill tells the West End all about the Jews in the slums of Whitechapel. Miss Murfree tells the North and East all about the ins and outs of life in the Tennessee mountains. We are familiar with Cape Cod and Simla, with "Brer Fox" and "Brer Rabbit," with Cable's Creoles, and Rolf Boldrewood's Australians. Amélie Rives introduces us to West Virginian ginseng diggers. Thomas Hardy transports us to the old-world cabins of Wessex peasants and woodlanders; William Black to the bothies of Highland crofters. "Q," with his Cornishmen, Mrs. Field with her Moonlighters, are other instances. There is no part of Connemara, no district of the Sierras or the Canadian West, which now lacks its *vates sacer*, its inspired illustrator. And I hold that this tendency to minute specialization and localization is closely bound up with the purposive tendency in fiction; both because the same men and women are engaged in either type, and because the delineation of strange undercurrents and phases of human life is in itself educational.

Hardy, for example, who gave us *Under the Greenwood Tree*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and *Far from the Madding Crowd*, is also Hardy who gave us *Tess of the d'Urbervilles* and *Jude the Obscure*. Hall Caine, who sets before us the Isle of Man and its Deemsters, is Hall Caine who, though from the conservative side (as I take it), approaches those same underlying problems of sex which form the main theme of Hardy and Meredith. Moreover, the passion for the description of local, rural, and distinctively tribal or provincial life is closely bound up with the revolt of race, the seething and pervasive democratic movement which in Europe at least is bringing the Celt, the Slav, the Czech, and the Magyar to the front, as against the old dominant English, German, and Latin elements. The dregs and the scum will have their innings. Hence the modern Celtic revival in Scotland, represented by Fiona Macleod, William Sharp, Patrick Geddes, and their compeers; hence the Celtic revival in Ireland, represented by Yeats, Nora Hopper, and so many other vigorous new writers; hence the Scandinavian outburst, the fresh young Russian literature; hence Jokai and Maeterlinck; hence the flowering of the Breton in Renan, Guy de Maupassant, and seafaring Pierre Loti—the latter of whom represents for France the same roving or specializing tendencies as are represented for England by Stevenson and Kipling, for America by Bret Harte, Miss Murfree, and Cable. (I need hardly say I am speaking again not as to style but as to subject-matter.) Nay, is it not even a significant fact in the same direction that England has read with deep attention Miss Mary Wilkins's New England tales and Mr. Harold Frederic's *Illumination*—in which forcible story we are transported on the enchanted carpet of fiction to a village in Northern New York, where mention of Europe is not, yet where the self-same problems of faith and life meet the local minister which meet every thinker in London, Paris, Berlin, Vienna? It is the purpose that makes such localized work universally interesting.

If we take Europe as a whole, I do not think we can doubt the constant progress of its literature in purposiveness during the past half-century. Even Hugo, prince and false prophet of romanticists—poor fallen god, whom all may now rail at—showed in his own way the prevailing tendency. For what is *Les Misérables* but a sermon on the underlying text of socialism? What are *Le Roi s'amuse*, and *Les Travailleurs de la Mer*, but disguised social and political pamphlets? With the younger gener-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ation, however, the tendency has been still more marked. Even Alexandre Dumas *fils* showed it. In Zola purposiveness reigns supreme—a cold, scientific, plodding purposiveness, as wooden as French scientific work in general; yet full of meaning in every line and touch and incident. A careless reader might deny the same note to Guy de Maupassant and Bourget, who, indeed, fall largely into the same wide category as our own Stevenson. (I hope it will be borne in mind that I am everywhere dealing with all these writers from a single standpoint only—*not* that of technical literary criticism.) But Maupassant and Bourget themselves—especially the latter—have an underlying purposiveness that cannot be masked by their artistic conscience. As for the North, the case is clear. Ibsen more than any other man stands out for us to-day as the accepted pioneer of the twentieth century; and Ibsen never writes except because he has something in his soul to teach us. *The Doll's House, Hedda Gabler, Ghosts, The Master Builder*—what does the outcry against them signify save that Ibsen had an original idea to impose upon the world, and that the world as yet was not ready to accept it? Only new principles can ever rouse such virulent opposition. And similarly with the Russians. Tolstoi's ideas do not seem to me the ideas that are likely to rule the coming world; but at any rate they are ideas; and it is for the sake of the ideas that Tolstoi writes, not merely to give us passing pleasure.

Taking the world round, then, I say (and omitting on purpose America, with which I do not feel myself competent to deal), I see one truth standing out quite clearly. From first to last, the nineteenth century has constantly demanded, and has constantly been supplied with, more and more purposive fiction The demand and the supply still continue to increase. Therefore I infer that the literature of the twentieth century in turn will be increasingly purposive.

And in being so, it will also be *right*. It will follow a law of all literary development from the beginning of all things. A broad survey of the progress of literature from its outset will show us that purpose has ever played a larger and larger part in literary work with each age in each nation.

Every literature begins with naïve and somewhat childish narration—the myth, the epic, the fairy-tale, the saga. As it progresses, it grows deeper, more philosophic, more ethical, more

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

purposive. The best never comes out of a civilized man, save when he is profoundly stirred by some overpowering social or moral emotion. Our test of the higher as opposed to the lower art is just, othe things equal, the proportion of this philosophic and ethical interest to the mere æsthetic element. I do not mean to say, of course, that the highest literature, *as* literature, is the scientific treatise, the philosophic essay, the ethical pamphlet. To guard against that misconception, I insert above on purpose the saving clause, "other things equal." Literature must needs above all things be literary—it must have grace of style, beauty and aptness and novelty of wording; it must appeal first of all to the æsthetic sense, not to the pure reason or the moral nature. But granting the presence of these purely literary qualities, that literature is highest which most combines with them a deeper philosophic and moral value. Why do we all feel Shelley to be far and away the greatest of English poets? (I exclude Shakespeare, who is the first of English novelists and dramatists, but not quite the first of English poets.) Clearly because we all feel that Shelley touched heights of philosophic thinking and of moral beauty never elsewhere combined with such exquisite imagery, such poetic imagination, such immortal melody. Why do we all feel Keats to stand just one degree beneath Shelley's level? Clearly because Keats, in other respects the most poetical of English poets, the finest example of pure poetic temperament, falls short of philosophic and moral height; he is merely the perfection of the artistic nature. Why do we think *Hamlet*, again, a greater play than *Romeo and Juliet?* Clearly because we feel the deeper and more purposive thought in *Hamlet*. What makes *Faust* the chief crown of glory in German literature? Clearly, the breadth of its philosophic outlook, the vastness of its aim, the profound moral vistas of which it allows us here and there to catch passing glimpses. Height may be measured, other things equal, by the greatness of the philosophic and ethical admixture.

Take in detail a few examples. Hellenic literature begins, like all other literatures, with the mere heroic story. We admire in its first efforts the Homeric ring, the full-mouthed sonorousness; we are captivated by the remoteness from our world and its problems—by the clash of bronze arms, the *naïveté* and simplicity of the domestic relations, the clang of the Iliad, "the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

roar and thunder of the Odyssey." We listen open-mouthed to the doughty deeds of Diomede, the song of the Sirens, the tale of Calypso, the ravings of Polyphemus. But we feel to the end that, strange and beautiful and weird as are these old-world imaginings, with their vivid pictures and their rolling music, they are childish at heart with the childishness of the barbarian; they do not in any way satisfy the longings and aspirations of civilized humanity; their interest is largely fictitious and archæological. Indeed, it is as a relief and refuge from our "obstinate questionings of invisible things" that we most enjoy the change from our own literature to the purely objective and barbaric atmosphere of the Homeric poems.

Very different is the tone of the great Athenian tragedians. There we feel at once the conservative grandeur and solemnity of Æschylus; the philosophic doubt and ethical inquiry of Sophocles; the frank scepticism and human reconstruction in many plays of Euripides. What a gulf between the quarrels of the gods in the Iliad and the sublime suffering and patience of the bound Prometheus! What a gulf between the despotic tone of the Homeric Agamemnon or the Homeric Odysseus, say in the incident of Thersites and the pæan of triumphant freedom in the *Persæ*, the outburst of human passion in the *Antigone* or the *Bacchæ!* Greek literature grows steadily from the descriptive and interesting to the profound and purposive; it finds its culminating point at last in the reasoned philosophic and ethical thinking of the Attic tragedians.

Take the three other great epics of the world, again—the *Æneid*, the *Divina Commedia*, and *Paradise Lost;* what comfort can the advocates of the novel or poem without a purpose derive from those great works? They must be clever indeed if they can wriggle round them. Look at the *Æneid* first. What made a brother bard break forth beforehand in that enthusiastic declaration,

> "*Cedite Romani scriptores, cedite Graii,*
> *Nescio quid majus nascitur Iliade?*"

Was it not his consciousness that the *Æneid* was the worthy and fitting epic of a great unifying and cosmopolitanizing movement—that movement which made Rome not so much the mistress as the embodiment of a pacified and unified world, and which

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

enabled a later poet to apostrophize her with truth in that eloquent pentameter,

"*Urbem fecisti quod prius orbis erat?*"

It is this overpowering sense of the majesty and the moral destiny of Rome—this conception of the organic evolution of a world-city from a small beginning—that inspired Virgil so high above even the level of the Second Georgic. This it is that makes him recur so often to the mighty future of the race of Æneas and to set in the very forefront of his noble exordium the stirring line:

"*Tantæ molis erat Romanam condere gentem.*"

Or, look at Dante again. Can anybody deny that the main inspiring idea of Dante's colossal work is the true mundane order, the proper relation of Church and State, of Priest and Prince, of Pope and Emperor? There, as on the frescoed wall of Santa Maria Novella, we behold the crystallized concept of the great European party to which the poet belonged—the concept of a well-organized and well-governed Europe, still regulated by the splendid Roman and Virgilian ideal, *plus* the new feature of the Christian religion. Whether we agree with this ideal or not, it was, at least, a large and liberal conception; it was vital in its day, and it dominates every line of the Tuscan poet's thinking.

As for Milton, he pleads guilty to purposiveness from the very beginning—pleads guilty, and glories in it. "To vindicate the ways of God to man" is the expressed purpose of the argument in his epic. And every word the mighty Puritan wrote is intensely purposive. *Paradise Lost* is a theory of theology—and heretical at that. *Samson Agonistes* is a political pamphlet. *Comus* is a singularly unconvincing though beautiful and fanciful tract on the ascetic side of the question of sex—just as the essay on *Freedom of Divorce* is a later expression of mature opinion in favor of a particular form of laxity. From beginning to end, Milton was a glorified and ennobled pamphleteer; he wrote his pamphlets with a purpose first and a divine beauty second, for without the purpose they would never have been written.

Every other literature tells us the same tale. We start in all with sagas, stories, folk-songs, *märchen*. We progress to the drama and novel of character; we end with the Euripideses, the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Ibsens, the Merediths. Chaucer and Boccaccio form the first term in a series which goes steadily on to Shelley and Goethe. And we all instinctively feel that the greatest and truest poets and romancers are those who have taught their age somewhat: Wordsworth, not Scott; Shelley, not Byron. Even outside the more definitely purposive work, we also feel that relative height may best be gauged by intensity of purpose. Keats himself, when judged by this standard, is really purposive; for in a world too dead to the worth of pure beauty, he revived the naked Greek ideal of the simply beautiful. With Tennyson, the highest work is surely that which, like *In Memoriam*, *Maud*, and such lyrics as *Wages*, or *The Higher Pantheism*, strives to realize some aspect of the philosophic and religious thought of the epoch he mirrored. Anybody who looks for the keynote in Rossetti and Swinburne will similarly find it in the love sonnets and in such poems as *The Blessed Damosel*, the *Ode to Victor Hugo*, *Hertha*, the *Lines to a Crucifix*, the *Hymn to Proserpine*, and *Dolores*—all of which image forth some thought of the period. I end where I began. The greatest novels and the greatest poems are thus clearly seen to be those which most *mark time* for humanity.

A work of art, I admit, is not a pamphlet or a proposition in Euclid, but it must enclose a truth, and a new truth, at that, if it is to find a place permanently in the front rank of its own order. Even of other arts than literature this is essentially true—as witness Botticelli, Burne Jones, Donatello, Wagner. Painting, sculpture, music, to be truly great, must crest the wave of their own epoch. In literature, however, no work can be considered as really first-rate unless it teaches us somewhat—not merely pleases us. The critic who insists on absence of purpose is shown by the greatest examples of the past, and by the working of the time-spirit, to be merely a belated and antiquated anachronism.

Thus the novel without a purpose stands condemned on its very face as belonging inherently to the second class, and to the infancy of humanity. It will continue to be written, no doubt, for the younger generation, and the inferior minds; but in the twentieth century, I venture to believe, the adult and educated public will more and more demand from its literary caterers adult interests, adult sympathies, a philosophic aim, an ethical purpose.

GRANT ALLEN.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A NEWPORT SYMPOSIUM.

BY MRS. BURTON HARRISON.

On the veranda of the Newport house appertaining to the clever and well-to-do Mrs. Gramercy, *of New York, a party of people are drinking tea while discussing the formation of an ideal society that shall take precedence over the corporate body at present distressing America at large as the "*Four Hundred*" of New York.*

The hostess (*to* Mr. Gryde, M. P., *who having landed the Saturday previous from the "Lucania," and journeyed at once to see Niagara, has arrived in Newport thoroughly equipped as a commentator on American social life*). And pray, what hints have you to contribute to our Utopian project?

Mr. Gryde (*spare and dark, with tonsured head, dressed in a neatly fitting suit of gray cassimere and wearing in his button-hole a large bunch of white carnations*). Oh! my dear lady, you expect too much of a new-comer. But—if you will permit a mere ghost of a suggestion—

Mrs. Gramercy (*with resignation*). I see by your smile that we are going to get it! But, go on.

Mr. Gryde (*dispassionately, but warming to his subject.*) If I had any improvement whatever to suggest in your present amiable and gracious system of social life, it is that you might recall a certain quality of gay and good-humored daring that I seem to remember—that we old-country people have learned to expect from you Americans, and banish a conventionalism that is both material and dull.

Mrs. Gramercy (*to the circle*). Didn't I say so? They always do, when they begin. But go on. Let the British lion growl!

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Mr. Gryde (*patiently*). In the ideal society, I should exclude from your drawing-rooms the present abiding evidence of, and the frequent allusion to, money and money's worth.

Mrs. Gramercy. Oh! Oh! As if you English are not the Mammon worshippers of Europe.

Mr. Gryde. Granted. But we do not talk of it at the dinner table. In the ideal society, the host will not entertain the stranger guest with astonishing statements of the money-getting achievement of his neighbors and fellow-revellers. When a noble portrait, painted by some great foreign artist, of the host's wife or daughter, is exhibited, the guest will not be allowed to know the amount of the check rendered in lieu of it. If the host has written a rather successful book upon political economy or finance, he will not confide the retail price of the volume in question when about to offer to present a copy to his friend. If a man takes a stranger for a drive behind a beautiful and coveta-ble pair of well-bred horses, the stranger will not need to know the price paid for them, in order to appreciate their merits. If a new room—some grand *salon* fitted with tapestries from a decayed palace of the Old World—is thrown open, the astonishing cost of these sumptuous draperies will not be whispered about among the guests. When a lovely woman is pointed out at a ball, the chain of jewels around her swan-like neck will not be appraised by her exhibitor. I almost think that, in your ideal society, there should be no such word as dollar.

Pretty little Mrs. Pert (*who, to the air of a fashion plate, adds a young child's readiness for fearless attack*). Or we might impose a fine of one dollar for charity, every time the word dollar is pronounced. But, dear me, Mr. Gryde, how much you have found out in three days at Newport! Let me tell you that, if you only give us time, we will get over being impressed by our recent acquisitions. Over here, we are still, as you would say, "by way" of thinking it an important thing to dine at eight o'clock, and be served by liveried lackeys. In England, you've had ages in which to exhaust all such minor sensations.

Mr. Gryde (*benignantly*). We have exhausted most sensations—*except* that to be had in bowing down before the shrine of Beauty.

Little Mrs. Pert. Well, at home, you don't do much bowing down that I ever saw—unless, indeed, the Beauty belongs to some

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

one else. In that respect, I own, we are behind you. But we are trying hard to catch up.

Mrs. Gramercy. For shame, Edith. It is no such thing, Mr. Gryde. As a class, we are still Puritans.

The Count de Rivoli (*a blonde young Frenchman, of charming exterior and polished manner*). Madame, I agree with you. So much so, that I ask myself if my penetration be not at fault—if beneath the frozen surfaces so many of your beautiful women present there is not a warm current flowing that needs only the freedom of older societies to break the ice and make it leap into joyous evidence.

Little Mrs. Pert. Unless you are a very good skater, Count, I'd advise you not to venture on that ice.

Mrs. Gramercy. Perhaps the Count will give us a point or two upon what we are to omit from our ideal society.

The Count de Rivoli. Madame! You ask me, who am daily enchanted with the exquisite graciousness of your American hospitalities. But if you insist—if I may presume to follow in the footsteps of Mr. Gryde, to find a fault in the present structure—I should suggest—with a thousand apologies—a slight infusion of gayety into your too formal entertainments. Your houses, your women, your wines, your *chefs*—deserve all admiration; but I would ask to hear talk across the table, instead of little eternal duets around the table—that talk of the wits and of the lips that makes a good dinner a refinement of delight. In the future day you picture, perhaps people will not be chained to each other, two and two, like galley slaves, during the courses of an interminable banquet. The hostess will assume to take the lead of conversation; to let fly a shuttlecock of thought or fancy at which her guests will strike in turn. She will not be content to sit on demurely or wearily while the dining lasts, and look relieved when the affair is over. And ah! Madame, picture to yourself how easy this thing will be for the average American woman—to put life into her reunions! She, who is so gifted by nature with facility of speech and animation of spirit! I cannot for the life of me understand the indifference of some of your reigning hostesses to everything except their decorations, their gowns and their *menus*.

Little Mrs. Pert. You would, if you'd seen them, not so very long ago, living in little hum-drum city houses, with an Irish

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

girl to wait upon the table, and everything on a scale to correspond. Isn't it like a fairy tale to wake up from that sort of thing and find oneself mistress of a palace in town, a yacht, another palace in the country, and with ability to roam the round world over, and spend money like pouring out water? If that happened to me, I know I'd be dazzled too, and not quite certain what to do with my grandeur.

Mrs. Kindly (*bright-eyed and middle-aged and soft of voice*). Yes, I think it's wonderful that so many of them carry it off as we see them doing. And, with it all, some of them accomplish an immense amount of charitable work, and educate their children beautifully. I, for one, when they ask me, always love to go into one of their fairy palaces, to be part, as Edith says, of a fairy tale. But I should be sorry to be limited to that class of society. Some of them are so taken up with spending money lavishly, they have hardly time to look around them at the outside world; and, consequently, their atmosphere seems stagnant. Whenever I have been to one of the plutocratic luncheon parties, for example, I like to stop in on the way home to sit awhile with an invalid friend of mine, a woman who has never crossed the threshold of one of the "smart set." How her wit plays around everything I give her of what I have seen and heard to comment upon! How supremely she rises above the narrow limits of the talk I have been listening to about petty ailments, and domestic plans, and the matrimonial difficulties of some conspicuous person of the "set." When the ideal society opens its doors, this friend of mine shall have a corner in it, and you will see how animated her surroundings will become. But I would not exclude the present rulers. We are too much in their debt.

Mrs. Gramercy. While we are excluding, I should like to shut out a fashion of woman who has cropped up latterly; not only mannish and brusque, and given to horse-play and lounging and smoking with men in preference to congregating with her own sex—but persistently inclined to talk down the domestic and sentimental side of a woman's life. (Bless me! When one fancies a woman's lot *without* the domestic and sentimental side!) I have often heard such an one scoff at the natural instinct of affection displayed by a young wife and mother for her husband and child—a "kid," is, I believe, what that type calls her own or

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

her friend's offspring. What she is good for I can't imagine. She doesn't really entertain men, and she intimidates average women.

Miss Ruth Marchmont (*a girl past her first youth, with a keen intellectual face and a fearless bearing*). Pshaw! That sort has no real weight. A woman of any strength of character will live her own life, and find her own happiness, in spite of their sneers at femininity. They are only temporary blots on the surface of our society. I think I object more to the ones who are satisfied with infinite nothings, who fritter conversation, and stare superciliously at all expressions of original thought, then resume their own chatter without an attempt to take in what has been said. When we open the door into the ideal *salon*, pray Heaven they may be left in the corridor.

Mr. Gryde (*to* Mrs. Gramercy). Triviality of thought and expression, and bluntness of speech, seem to be the "hall mark" upon the fashionable classes everywhere to-day. But I must own I had not yet reached the point of criticising your types, especially of womankind. I look to this conversation for a great deal of enlightenment. Pray, my dear madam, further incite your guests to give me more of these lights upon American society as it is, and as it ought to be.

Mrs. Gramercy (*smiling*). I am afraid we are always ready to discuss. Nobody is certain what our standard is; and everybody is curious to know what other people think it is. Unfortunately, we are actually without social leaders. With you, in England, it is so easy to look at a Duchess, and do likewise. When we get back to town every year to open our houses for the season we have no idea who, among our acquaintances, is going to be living in her own house, or to be entertaining, much less setting us examples. The newspaper correspondents make the most heroic effort to create for us heads, who, often as not, are at the time living in London or Paris or at Nice, or travelling in Egypt to get rid of disagreeables at home. I myself think it is the fierce light that beats upon the throne of the New York social celebrity that makes our leaders so few and far between. As soon as a newspaper article appears that is more than any feminine flesh and blood can stand, they remember they have the resource of packing up and sailing for the other side, there to remain until the trouble has been forgotten. Then, too, we have no old women.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Look around you, Mr. Gryde, during the next few days, and you will never see a woman's head with a cap upon it, like those dear old stately dowagers one sees in England. To the bitter end of comeliness, we coif ourselves with false hair, and dress youthfully. Oh! (*Here the mistress of the veranda claps her white hands begemmed with diamonds and turquoises.*) In the ideal society, let us have some gray hair and some caps!

Mrs. Kindly. I am sure, Agatha, you and I know several older women, of the best blood in the land too, women whose families have always been accustomed to lead in New York, who could still lead if they exerted themselves to do so—and who dress and bear themselves most becomingly. I am afraid Mr. Gryde will think you are trifling, dear.

Little Mrs. Pert. Mr. Gryde must be quite accustomed to sitting still and having all kinds of rash remarks flying about his head. Don't trouble yourself about him, Mrs. Kindly. I have a conviction that, when he has done listening to our talk, he will have got some points of view that neither Mr. Bryce, nor Mr. Burns, nor M. Bourget seem to have discovered.

Mrs. Gramercy (*pleasantly*). You flatter yourself, Edith.

Little Mrs. Pert. Of course I do. I shouldn't be an American woman, else.

Mr. Easy (*a bachelor of wealth and good temper, who has been on the outskirts of the group devoting himself to a débutante*). When is our turn to come, Mrs. Gramercy?

Mrs. Gramercy. Do you mean what place shall we assign to the men of the day in our new Wonderland? Don't fear; we shall not neglect you. I have a word to say about the eccentrics of society who are made to do duty before the world as figure-heads of our New York morals and manners. I suppose no society could be brought together without having people like these for the others to talk about. London has its full share, Paris as many. If they get in, we must take care to let others see them as we really do, and not exalt these people we are laughing at among ourselves as arbiters and models. Then, there is a character in modern life who always reminds me of the tug that conveys a big steamship out of places where there is any difficulty for it to move alone—the toady, generally well-placed in the world, and often limited in purse, who accompanies the new-rich person in public, and shares her luxuries. In an ideal group

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

people will be sure of themselves, and the parasite will find her occupation gone.

Mr. Gryde (*quoting "King Canute."*) "Parasites exist always." On my word, I do not see the great difference between your types in New York and ours in London.

Mrs. Gramercy. Except that London is so much bigger, more animated, your average society is not judged by them. We, who are talking of these things, are in revolt, you see, against being classed, without an opportunity for protest, with a small and extremely narrow set of money-spenders whose fortunes dwarf ours, and whose customs extinguish more moderate endeavor among us. We should like the rest of the world to know we have some individuality apart from them. Even the keen sighted and friendly M. Bourget judged the whole of us by the few he met.

The Count de Rivoli. M. Bourget, Madame, meant to be all that is kind. It was such doughty champions as your M. Mark Twain who, entering the lists against him in serious earnest, made his utterances seem a more grave offence than they were.

Miss Marchmont. No doubt. No doubt. But you will not ask us to admit many of M. Bourget's American women into our ideal society.

Mr. Gryde (*to* Mr. Easy, *who has come around to his side, and dropped into a wicker chair by the tea-table*). Tell me. Am I to gather from what these ladies have been saying that your framers of the Constitution, when they shut out hereditary aristocracy from America, did not prevent the subsequent risk of a plutocratic aristocracy that is quite generally recognized throughout the country, and must, of necessity, be more harmful to your national character than our own abused respect for hereditary titles ?

Mr. Easy (*comfortably*). Hum ! They say so ; but I believe most of it is newspaper talk, you know. Capital good fellows among that set, and no idea in the world of putting themselves on a pinnacle. No show about them, either, though they rather like to see their wives and daughters cut a dash.

Mr. Gryde (*stroking his chin*). This change in the conditions of the national mind of America seems to me immensely curious, and full of portent for the future.

Little Mrs. Pert (*catching his last words*). Don't make your-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

self unhappy about our future, Mr. Gryde, now that we women have got it in hand It's sure to be run well, if Mrs. Gramercy and Miss Marchmont and I take hold.

Mrs. Gramercy. I think we shall put a lock on your saucy tongue, Edith, if we let you in at all Mr. Gryde, promise me to come to luncheon next Sunday when my husband will be here, and to let him talk over these matters with you from a man's point of view. I just wish you not to think that women dispose of every question in the States. Now, Ruth, dear, have we summed up all the things to be left out ?

Miss Marchmont (*sighing*). I'm afraid not. The list is so long. You know we have always agreed that the people who do not value social triumph unless the newspapers display it to the world, are not to be let in. And those who do everything in such a hurry that they make one feel as if one's breath had given out. The fussy women, overcrowded with affairs ; the women who wear jewels in day time ; those who in company talk all together in a high and shrill key—

Little Mrs. Pert (*interrupting*). I vote that we have done with the women, and go for the men.

Mrs. Gramercy, Miss Marchmont and Mrs. Kindly (*together*). Agreed !

A silence, which is broken by Mrs. Gramercy. I'll declare, it is not so easy as I thought. It really seems as if we could not carry on the functions of social life without the "ornamental" men ; there must be some on hand for dinners and opera boxes, and as ushers at weddings, and to lead cotillions, and drive four-in-hands, and sit behind club-windows. One reason New York is less attractive to look at than London is the rarity of this class in her uptown haunts. Some of them may not be very brilliant in conversation, but others are very lively, agreeable fellows, with plenty of native good sense and rather inclined to condole with themselves upon the leisure of their existence. Besides, they are generally cultivated in minor points, given to manly exercise, and—

Little Mrs. Pert (*interrupting*). In short, they meet a "felt want."

Miss Marchmont. I have no patience with you two.

Mrs. Gramercy. Until we shall have trained up a race of men who will not regard meetings for the interchange of ideas

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with women as a bore, who is to take the place of those we now have? If the clever strong-brained men who, it must be, inhabit all those thousands of "offices" down-town, will not consent to emerge from them, what can we poor women do but make the best of the substitutes we have? I believe there are some American men who would regard an afternoon call upon a woman of society, who might offer him a cup of tea at five o'clock, as a distinct admission that he is a weakling and a fribble. This sort of resentment of conventionality is what often makes our men of parts seem crude in the eyes of trained foreigners. It appears to me about on a par with the refusal of the schoolboy to learn how to dance, because it makes him "girly"!

Mrs. Kindly. My dear, you are quite right. There are some of my young nephews and cousins to whom I am always preaching the doctrine of cultivating the exterior graces until they are acquired, and then forgetting all about them. It is so hard to persuade these lads that they will be none the less stalwart, none the less successful in business or in professions, for having a certain grace of manner and tact of speech.

Little Mrs. Pert. But what are you to do when such young men see their fathers refusing to mix with society on the ground that it is all very well for the women, but they have no time to spend on it, or are too tired when evening comes to do more than read a newspaper?

Mrs. Gramercy. The fact is, our husbands and fathers strain too much after success in affairs, and subordinate every other concern to that of making money. Some are in the toils of absorbing and exacting professions, and all of them chase from morning till night "to accomplish in their own lifetimes what in the past it took centuries to effect." We American women, who have the name of being the most indulged class upon earth, are often denied the one luxury we should prefer to all others—leisure time in the society of our husbands.

Mr. Gryde. That is very pathetic. I wish some of these gallant countrymen of yours could hear it.

Miss Marchmont (*shrugs*). They might say it was just another one of our eternal fads. You see, Mr. Gryde, we have come around the circle to where we began; it is the worship of the golden calf that possesses us, and is our bane.

Mr. Gryde (*with a satisfied smile playing around the corners*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of his mouth). Material well-being! High intelligence! Haven't you reached the high-water mark of all society? Why strive for ideals beyond this?

Mrs. Gramercy. That was spoken with indulgence as to a spoiled child. No, we shall not relinquish our bright dream. The more one thinks of it, the wider grows the prospect. There is no capital, no great city, where it could be realized so well as in New York.

The Count de Rivoli. May I enquire your plan?

Mr. Easy. Don't ask. Just wait and see results. It will be sure to be all right, if these ladies are to the fore.

Mr. Gryde. I may be kept busy in my own country and have no chance to see. At least you will give me a general outline of the scheme.

Miss Marchmont. The truth is, so far we have chiefly concerned ourselves with the elements to be left out. For the rest, I have a dim idea of a broad luminous circle of intelligent people of many nations and creeds and pursuits; they will all have moderate or at least not immoderate fortunes, a common recreation ground, and frequent meetings.

Little Mrs. Pert. There you are, off on your hobby, Ruth. Now, *I* am nothing if not practical; and I can see that these divers elements would be very hard to bring together and harder still to keep together.

Mrs. Gramercy. I am convinced that it can be done. Every year adds to the numbers of the class we would draw upon. The walls, if you like, might be supported by the fine ladies with their Worth gowns and jewelled tiaras, though, I think, by that time, the big fortunes will have been graded down; but the central spaces would be thronged with men and women who read, and think, and travel, and discuss, and keep abreast of the movement of the times. Among them would be some of the present class of dwellers in hall bed-rooms in boarding-houses, who would thus find a place for the indulgence of the social instinct. There would be men who can't afford clubs and are bored by theatres; men hard worked all day, who would otherwise be dozing over a newspaper in dull rooms at home until it should be time to go to bed. Busy lawyers and doctors, newspaper men and magazine editors, authors, artists and actors, students of foreign languages, accomplished musicians, experts in science, re-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

turned travellers, teachers in schools, and professors in colleges—and, with them all, agreeable foreign visitors! What a host of these might not some Pied Piper of Hamelin witch out of their haunts even to-day in New York to enrich and enliven society? As it is, where does one ever see them congregate?

Little Mrs. Pert. Dear! You quite take my breath away. I hope there will be something for them to eat and drink beside little cakes and weak punch, the way they had it in the French *salons*. My experience is, to keep a genius up to the mark you have to feed him well.

Miss Marchmont (*sharply*). Nonsense! When it comes to this, I think we have talked long enough.

Mrs. Gramercy (*suavely*). Nobody minds Edith. But we shall not adjourn this assemblage until Mr. Easy gives us a glimpse into his opinion on this important theme. In the ideal society we will allow man to speak his mind, you know—after the ladies shall have uttered themselves, of course, and with reservation of our right to the last word if he chances to say anything deserving a reply.

Mr. Easy. In the first place, I think the ideal society will have done much to justify itself, if it abolishes the pernicious practice of promiscuous hand-shaking. Mr. Gryde will perhaps pardon me if I suggest that his countrymen of to-day are, in that matter, even more trying than we are. It is not everybody's hand that even a friend desires to take into his own, under all circumstances. And the only really agreeable method for an ordinary function of that sort is the Chinaman's. Among them, when a newcomer joins a group like this, for instance, there may be a good deal of hand-shaking, to be sure; but nobody shakes the other fellow's. Each clutches his own two hands very cordially, and shakes them with smiling salutation to everybody else.

Mr. Gryde. Yes; I think *that* a very good suggestion.

Mr. Easy. And, while I am making an example of the Orientals, I would borrow another idea from them for our new society. Much of the discomfort we get from envy of our neighbors, and many of the distressing disturbances of the serenity of our present social relations arise from the fact that our neighbor had a grandfather, and we had not. In China, the arrangement is much better; their polity is founded upon respect and vener-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ation for parents; among them, no man can be greater than his own father; and so, if he himself rises to be a prince, it is immediately discovered that his father was really a prince before him—and *his* father before *him*—"and so go on *ad infinitum*" into the remotest antiquity. Though the world may have seen those ancestors in the garb and avocation of rat-catchers, their self-imposed disguise is immediately penetrated in the light of the merit of their descendant; their modesty is no longer suffered to obscure their greatness. And when the elevation of an individual here shall ennoble, not his offspring, but all of his ancestors, every one in our ideal society, where every one is to be distinguished by merit of some kind, may be happy in the ease of manner and repose of mind which now belong only to one who has inherited such traits from at least three generations of training in everything of gentility demanded by the social code.

Mr. Gryde. What prompt relief you would thus afford to those of us in England who yearn to abolish the House of Lords!

Mr. Easy. And, if the ladies will indulge me a moment longer, I venture to suggest to them a final detail of infinite consequence to real happiness in any re-arrangement of society in America. Every school, everywhere, should have competent instructors in the use of the voice; every physician should carry in his pocket a prompt and effectual remedy for our national catarrh. There was a time the rustic Yankee dialect afforded the type for ridicule of our new-world snarl in utterance. But, whether New England has in this respect improved (and I think it has), or some of our more recent regions have developed peculiarities of voice so much more vexatious as to make the Yankee only seem better by comparison with others, the fact is that our most distressing twang in speech to-day is found west of the Hudson River. There is a metallic, unmusical and harsh buzz in the letter R, especially, that bewrayeth us to the least discerning of the rest of mankind; it ought to be abolished by you reformers, even if you must make a new alphabet that has no letter R in it. And, not only that, but, as we have ceased to be of a sparse population, our voices have become too loud. Our immigrants of nearly three hundred years ago brought with them the low and soft voices of their English progenitors; in the wilderness that received them they felt the awe of great solitudes, and must for a time have spoken in subdued tones—as do the wan-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

derers to-day in the remote valleys of the great mountain ranges, or over the vast plains of our western wilds. But, as the woods have been cleared away and the prairies have come under cultivation and cities have multiplied, we have learned to address each other in voices like so many peacocks on house-tops exchanging views of the disturbers of the night. The distracting duets the Count has just mentioned as incidents of our dinner parties, are as nothing to the din, clangor, and uproar of a crowded afternoon tea in town. Yes, really you ladies must see to it that no one be admitted into our ideal society whose voice has not been properly assuaged.

Mrs. Gramercy. Come, come, Mr. Easy, what you say is all very true, and we shall make a note of it; but when we asked you for an opinion we hardly expected you to go on at such length. Mr. Gryde, we have treated you unmercifully. But you shouldn't have encouraged us by that twinkle of the eye. And all the rest of you good people have submitted, like angels, to being talked at. Now come into the drawing-room, and let us have some music.

Mr. Gryde. Not till I thank you for having given me a glimpse at a new—a truly national, and I think a possible—structure of republican society.

Mrs. Gramercy (*quietly*). It will come—though I may not be here to see it.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

HOW TO PROLONG LIFE.

DR. HARLEY, in the London *Lancet* of June 18, 1889, calls attention to certain facts often observed by breeders of horses. It is that the recuperative capacity of high-bred horses is less than that of the common quality. He holds that men living in a rude state, such as savages and gypsies, tramps, and the like, and deficient in the refining influences of high civilization, have higher bodily recuperative powers than the intellectual classes. In other words, the more refined our civilization makes us the less able we are to resist disease and recover from its attacks. By the year 1900 probably some other M. D. will take just the opposite view and rout and flout Dr. Harley from all his strong positions. When wise and learned physicians disagree the lawyers and clergy report that the undertaker is usually the referee. (I cannot believe this.) Perhaps the attorney or parson who started this story was some brother in black who had been charged too much for his visits after he was well enough to get along without his M. D. In cases of doubt it is always best to hear both sides. It is said to be a scientific fact that in racing stables firstlings are not preferred. Some writers on longevity in the human being argue from this that first-born children are not so likely to reach extreme age as others of the same family. But we must remember that in the horse it is speed that is required and not longevity. Horses are bred for trotting and racing qualities, not for long life.

Firstlings that are scorned by the fast men and fast horses of the race track may long survive their more lucky brethren who have had the triumphs of a fast life and a merry one. It is to our own indiscretions that imperfections in the digestive and blood-making process are to be charged. The practical point is that we impose upon our organs too much work not only by the undue quantity we eat, but also by the injurious quality of the food and drink we furnish them. People of good common sense, without any scientific knowledge even, soon learn this and avoid such things as they know from experience they are better without. Statements of those who have reached great age nearly always show that they were moderate eaters. Moderation in eating and drinking means moderation in work for the digestive machinery, saving of physical worry to the arteries by keeping the blood which courses through them free from the impurities that may impair the arterial coats. The intestinal canal, the lymphatic system, the salivary glands, pancreas, liver, kidneys, and skin, are all relieved in their functions when too much unnecessary work is not put upon them by a desire to eat improper food and too much of it.

As the question of food enters so largely into the subject of long and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

healthy life, some suggestions seem called for in regard to what may be considered most suitable for persons of sixty and upward. It has been urged that a return to nature, or to the food which primitive man nourished his body upon would be the right thing to do. Fruits and nuts appear to have been his dietary, and not flesh and vegetables. Oranges, apples, grapes, figs, bananas, dates, prunes, peaches, and in fact all kinds of sweet fruits and tomatoes are good, because they are deficient in nitrogen and free from the earth salts of other kinds of food. Starchy foods are more difficult to digest than fruits and meats. Nuts, such as almonds, Brazil nuts, filberts, walnuts, hickory nuts, and similar products abound in nourishment and furnish the necessary heat for the body.

Eggs, fish, cheese, milk, especially buttermilk, and poultry of all kinds supply variety. Starch foods are clogging to the system, producing constipation. Invalids are always put upon toasted bread, because the heat acting upon the starchy portions turns it into dextrine; this, being changed to glucose by the action of the stomach, is easily disposed of. Glucose is the sugar of nature as found in ripe sweet apples and in honey. Dried figs, which can be made almost as good as fresh ones, by steeping them in hot water, are extremely nutritious, containing about 68 per cent. of glucose. This when eaten is in just the same condition that the starch of cereal food is after it has undergone a protracted digestion.

Tea, coffee, wine and beer, as well as all alcoholic drinks, are to be taken in extreme moderation, as they are mere stimulants and have no nutriment, or at least very little. Milk is a better drink. As every one knows, if you eat slowly you do not need to drink at all. And that is one of the great advantages of a fruit diet, you get enough of the best quality of water distilled by nature in the fruit, which is also aperient and cooling to the blood, already too much heated by starch foods. Exclusive vegetarianism seems to be injurious to the human system. But people who advocate a diet of fruits and nuts, omitting starch foods and too much bread, are not vegetarians; for they get the heat and strength necessary for health from nuts, lean meats, lamb, veal, and young animals whose systems have not had time to get clogged with the objectionable earth salts. If fresh fruit cannot be obtained at all times, dried figs, raisins, and dates can be steeped in hot water and thus brought to an almost fresh condition. As for whole meal, or Graham bread, the merit that it may have is offset by its irritating effects upon the stomach and intestines, produced by the indigestible bran particles. Sugar furnished by nature in the form of glucose is ready for assimilation, as all physiologists and chemists know.

On the contrary, sugar from cane, beets, maple, and sorghum is insoluble by the system until it has undergone the process of digestion, both in the stomach and the intestines. Now, as salt, pepper, and all irritants, as well as stimulants, like tea, coffee, tobacco, and alcoholic beverages, are goads to the nervous system, the human body, if treated naturally, does not require them. To many they are really poisons. If we were intended for the use of tobacco, it would not make us so dreadfully sick the first time we used it. Man in a normal state does not have to learn to eat nuts and fruits. He craves them as the child does its mother's milk. Animal instinct indicates the law of nature. Since Cuvier's time zoologists have been telling us that man belongs to the frugivorous animals. He is allied to the manlike apes, which live entirely on nuts and fruits, never eating other animals nor cereals.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A Brooklyn physician, translating from a German writer, thus discourses on apples as food and medicine: "The apple is such a common fruit that few persons are familiar with its remarkably efficacious medicinal properties. Everybody ought to know that the very best thing they can do is to eat apples just before going to bed. The apple is excellent brain food because it has more phosphoric acid, in an easily digestible shape than any other fruit known. It excites the action of the liver, promotes sound and healthy sleep, and thoroughly disinfects the mouth. It also agglutinates the surplus acids of the stomach, helps the kidney secretions and prevents calculus growth, while it obviates indigestion and is one of the best preventives of diseases of the throat. Next to lemon and orange it is also the best antidote for the thirst and craving of persons addicted to the alcohol and opium habit."

Dr. De Lacy Evans, in his book *How to Prolong Life*, gives over twenty pages to tables of analysis of foods. As compared with the nourishment they give, fruits and nuts have the least proportion of earthy salts. Animal flesh comes next, then vegetables, and fourth in rank we have cereals and pulses, which are shown to have the largest amount of the earthy matters. From the analysis we see that fruits as distinct from vegetables have the least amount of earth salts. Most of them contain a large quantity of water, but that water is of the purest kind—a distilled water of nature—and has in solution vegetable albumen. We also notice that they are to a great extent free from the oxidized albumens—glutinous and fibrinous substances; and many of them contain acids—citric, tartaric, malic, etc.—which when taken into the system act directly upon the blood by increasing its solubility, by thinning it; the process of circulation is more easily carried on and the blood flows more easily in the capillaries—which become lessened in calibre as age advances—than it would if of a thicker nature. These acids lower the temperature of the body and thus prevent the wasting process of oxidation, or combustion in the system. Exhilarating and stimulating effects produced by tea, coffee, and chocolate, are caused by theine in tea, caffeine in coffee, and bromine in cocoa or chocolate—the latter containing a smaller percentage of the stimulant than the others. All have a similar alkaloid base. Milk has become extremely popular with all classes of physicians of late years. Formerly a fever patient was forbidden to take milk. In modern practice milk is about the only food allowed. An exclusive diet of milk is found very efficacious in diabetes. At the German spas, Carlsbad, Wiesbaden, etc., a very little bread is allowed and the diet mostly made up of milk, eggs, grapes and lean beef. A non-starch diet is the rule, bread, starchy vegetables and cereals being almost excluded. Rice is easily digested and an excellent food, except that it abounds in earth salts. Fruits are not only digested in the first stomach, but they have a large part of their nourishment already in a condition to be absorbed and assimilated as soon as eaten. The food elements in bread and cereals have to undergo a process of digestion in the stomach, and then be passed on to the intestines for a still farther chemical change before they are of use to the human system. This is the great advantage of a diet of lean meats and fruits.

Overwork is not expected from a stomach already jaded, and the nervous wear and tear of the organs of life are avoided. Distilled water should always be used both for drinking and cooking if it can be obtained. Rainwater, if filtered, is perhaps the next best, though not free from objections.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Grapes, say numerous authorities, act very much like mineral waters on the human system. But they are better, because at the same time they nourish the body. Nutrition is increased, secretion promoted, action of the liver, kidneys, and other excretory organs improved, and the phosphoric acid, of which they contain a considerable amount, acts favorably on all the bodily functions, especially on the brain. As is well known, the sugar of the grape requires no digestion, but is taken almost at once into the blood. Dextrine from the grape promotes the secretion of pepsin and thus favors digestion. Most of the vegetarians eat grapes, though they may prefer peas.

Stimulants often assist digestion, but that digestion is best which does not need them.

WILLIAM KINNEAR.

ITALIAN IMMIGRATION.

DR. SENNER'S article in the June number of the REVIEW contains much that is interesting, but exception must be taken to the way in which he handles some of his statistics, and the conclusions which he deduces from them.

(1.) It is to be observed that even during the fiscal years 1894 and 1895, when immigration fell off very much owing to the commercial depression, Italian immigration held its own proportion of the total. The figures are 1890, 11.4 per cent.; 1891, 13.5 per cent.; 1892, 10.6 per cent.; 1893, 16.4 per cent.; 1894, 14.9 per cent.: 1895, 13.7 per cent. In the first four months of the calendar year 1895, the percentage of Italian immigration of the total immigration at New York was 22.6 per cent. This year during the same period it was 30 per cent. During times of commercial depression the least skilled immigration is that which should diminish most; but, in spite of the number of persons recently unemployed in the United States, we find an increase this year over last in the Italian immigration of one-third, nine-tenths of which has no occupation.

(2.) During the spring of this year, it is true that a large number of Italian immigrants were detained for special examination, *i. e.*, there seemed to the inspectors something suspicious about their right to land. In spite of the great parade of the number detained, made from time to time in the newspapers, the number actually excluded has been the trifling fraction of 6.2 per cent., or thereabouts. One may well retort in Dr. Senner's own words, "*Tant de bruit pour une omelette!*" The law of March 3, 1893, was merely an administrative measure, and while it has to some extent improved the immigration service it has not added at all to the classes of persons who may be excluded by the inspectors. Even under this law the proportion debarred in 1894 was only 0.8 per cent. and in 1895 about 1 per cent.

(3.) But the most remarkable use of figures is that which Dr. Senner makes in connection with the settlement of Italian immigrants in the country. Out of those entering the United States during the first four months of 1896 he deducts one-half on the grounds that they have either been in the United States before or are going to join their immediate families, and claims that only the balance can properly be regarded as immigrants! And he says: "Congress cannot justly undertake to force out of this country aliens who have legitimately settled in it, or to prevent their immediate families, unless objectionable *per se*, from joining

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

them in this country." Very true. But the half which Dr. Senner excepts are precisely the half which are very objectionable *per se* on several grounds.

First, those who have been in the country before are, with few exceptions, 'birds of passage" who have been here not once merely, but several times; who came here to live for a time under degraded conditions at a low wage and soon carry their savings back to Italy. The fact that they migrate back and forth, instead of being in their favor, is a proof that they have no wish to assimilate and to permanently settle here; that they came here not to help build up the country, but to earn a few dollars. They have few wants; they make but a slight demand for commodities; they live in a way in which no American, German, or Irishman would live for a day. Of the recent immigration only 10.8 per cent. were women.

Consider next those going to join their immediate families. Perhaps this implies intention of settlement with some, or it may only mean that they go for work where they already know some one. If the latter, it is but a slight guaranty of permanent settlement; if the former there is clear evidence of the danger of increasing the enormous congestion in our Eastern cities, and especially in the slums of those cities which some of their countrymen have already helped to produce.

This should dispose of the exception in favor of this latter class which Dr. Senner would make in an educational test. Dr. Senner himself admits that illiteracy is invariably coupled with a low standard of living. Shall we make a dangerous exception to a wise test, or shall we ask the very reasonable and moderate favor that intending immigrants shall learn to read and write?

(4.) It is not true that "our immigration laws offer the fullest opportunity to any community or public institution burdened with immigrants who have become public charges within one year after landing, to rid themselves of them." Of 320 cases of sick poor relieved by the Massachusetts State Board of Lunacy and Charity last year, not over one-third could be identified so as to be turned over to the United States for deportation. The immigrants give false names and false statements as to the date and steamer on which they arrived, and often they are obliged to change their names for business purposes. There is no sure way of identifying them. The very fact that only 177 persons were returned by the United States in 1895, instead of showing how effective the law is, proves its total inadequacy in this particular.

Personally, I do not believe that boys who have to be shut up in Italian lunatic asylums for insanity produced by longing for the United States, would have been desirable immigrants.

(5.) Until some effective means can be devised for diverting Italian immigration to the West and South, we want no large body of Italian laborers. The Hebrew societies have spent large sums trying to settle Hebrew immigrants away from large cities. The experiment was a failure. Distribution can be effected only by voluntary migration. As to the other remedies suggested, our schools are already overburdened trying to assimilate the foreign born; and restrictions of the suffrage can be obtained, as Dr. Senner well knows, only after long agitation for constitutional amendments, and when most of the evils have been done. It is no protection whatever against social degradation. The burden should be put upon the immigrant of fitting himself to be a desirable settler.

Finally, there are many competent to judge who will not agree with Dr.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Senner that the bulk of recent Italian immigration is desirable. Eighty-six per cent. have no occupation; 68 per cent. are illiterate; 95 per cent. are destined for New England, New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania. But my chief purpose is to show some of the respects in which Dr. Senner's article is likely to mislead.

PRESCOTT F. HALL,
Secretary of the Immigration Restriction League.

THE TAXATION OF CHURCH PROPERTY.

MAN, as a social being, requires something beyond the coercive authority of civil statutes to impress upon him that obedience to moral obligation so necessary to the existence of all society and government. The object of our laws is the preservation and enforcement of right, but such is the imperfection of all human institutions, that there is a limit to municipal law, a boundary beyond which it cannot safely go; and passing which, it loses all its efficacy.

Positive law cannot extend to the correction of private vices of individuals, yet it is manifest that, unless such vices are suppressed, the peace and order of society must be seriously impaired, and good government impossible. This desideratum is supplied by the Church. Thus the Church is coadjutor of the State. It is as necessary to good government as the governmental organization itself. Hence it appears that the imposition of a tax upon church property would be almost as injudicious and quite as absurd a proceeding as the taxation of government property.

Such a course would be not only unwise but unjust. If churches were taxed the burden of taxation would fall, not upon a soulless corporation (as some have erroneously supposed), but upon the individual members thereof, who pay all expenses of maintenance. Churches are incorporated only for the purpose of convenience in their management. No person can be said to own church property in this country. It is usually held in trust for church purposes only. The individual places his money in this investment in obedience to what he conceives to be a holy duty to God, to himself, and to all mankind. He does not reap, nor hope or intend to reap, any pecuniary profit therefrom. Under such circumstances it would seem contrary to a spirit of right and justice to tax these properties. It would make religion a costly and expensive thing. It would operate to deter men from entering religious organizations. It would be contrary to the spirit of our law, as well as to the letter of twenty-four of the American constitutions, and numberless statutes of the various states.

Churches are not money-making institutions, and religious associations are not formed for private gain. These organizations are not alone for the spiritual benefit of their members, but for the moral elevation of all mankind. A church is a strong moral force in any community. Some of the largest eleemosynary institutions of the world are maintained solely by churches and religious societies. If these institutions were not so supported the government would be obliged to do it, for it is the moral duty of every government to care for its indigent, afflicted and insane. By disabling the promoters of these beneficent enterprises the government would simply add another expense to its own account.

Persons should be subject to taxation for the support of government, in the proportion in which they are respectively benefited by such government.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

That which adds to the stability of government and chiefly conserves the public weal, and upon which the state is largely dependent for its own security, should, from motives of reason and sound policy, be exempted from the burdens of taxation, when it can practically be fostered in no other way. Government owes a greater debt to religion than does the latter to the former. Religion thrived and flourished, when society was in a state of anarchy, but no government ever existed without some form of religion. Moreover, in the earlier ages of civilization, those who were most active in support of religion were always found among the principal advocates of good government. What power but the church could have established the "Truce of God," which, during an age of war and bloodshed, restored peace to Europe at such frequent intervals as to render perpetual warfare no longer possible? The charge that the mediæval clergy were supporters of despotism is refuted by Hallam in his *History of the Middle Ages*, and the same learned author remarks the impetus given by Christianity to the formation of civic institutions. The early Christians were the first to successfully oppose the galling tyranny of the Roman Empire. Lord Bacon denominates religion the chief band of human society, and the very derivation of the word itself shows that it was so considered by the ancients; *religion* being derived from the Latin *religio*—binding back the hands, meaning, evidently, a restraint.

The principles of the Christian religion are conducive to good government, the morals thereby inculcated redound to the good of society, and, by reason of its humanizing tendency, and that extended scope of sympathy which flows from a sense of brotherhood with all mankind, it has ever been a most potent factor in facilitating the forces of law and order, a fact recognized by the greatest commentators upon political ethics and jurisprudence. Blackstone, in the Fourth book of his *Commentaries*, states that "Christianity, as a national religion, is, abstracted from its own intrinsic truth, of the utmost consequence to the civil state"; and further, that "Christianity is part of the laws of England."

Montesquieu (*Esprit des Lois*) says: "Let us set before our eyes, on the one hand, the continual massacres of the kings and generals of the Greeks and Romans; and, on the other, the destruction of people and cities by those famous conquerors, Timur Bey and Jenghiz Khan, who ravaged Asia; and we shall see that we owe to Christianity in government a certain political law and in war a certain law of nations, benefits which human nature can never sufficiently acknowledge. . . . The principles of Christianity deeply engraved on the heart would be infinitely more powerful than the false honor of monarchies, than the humane virtue of republics, or the servile fear of despotic states."

The learned Guizot has observed, somewhere in his *History of Civilization in Europe*, that individual reason was more boldly developed in the church than in any other society; and, indeed, none can deny that many of the severest intellectual disputations that ever engaged a champion in the field of human polemics, originated among the students of the cloister. M. Guizot also enumerates Christianity among those forces which have had a principal share in the promotion of civilization.

Dr. Lieber recognizes the salutary influence of Christianity, and its beneficial effect upon society.

But a further review of the authorities upon this subject would be supererogatory. That the present admirable state of society and government was brought about more through Christianity than any other agency, none

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

can successfully controvert; that the church is the strongest and most extensive moral organization in existence none will attempt to deny; that it is the greatest moral teacher in the world to-day does not admit of doubt.

Religion and law must go together, for if there were no moral force behind the law its mandates would be worthless. Good laws are always desirable, but never valuable unless they can be enforced; and they can never be enforced unless there is an honest, law-abiding spirit among the people. The law cannot make good citizens. It can only regulate their conduct after another power has brought them into being. The generality of mankind do not understand that it is always best to obey the laws of their country; hence the frequent attempts to evade them and the penalties thereto annexed. At this point the church comes to the assistance of the state. If a man follow the precepts of Christianity there is little likelihood of his being aught but a good and law-abiding citizen.

Animated with a supreme love and solicitous regard for the young Republic of which he was taking official leave, the great Washington, in his Farewell Address, did not forget to say: "Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. . . . And let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion."

Without the restraining and wholesome influence of Christianity a large percentage of the people, especially those who are altogether unlearned (an element which comprises no inconsiderable portion of our population), would relapse into the most vicious immorality, thus forming a state of society in the highest degree incompatible with our form of government.

It has been affirmed by some, and not without great force of reasoning, that the government should tax the people for the support of religion, as is the case with many nations (notably a majority of the South American republics, and some European monarchies); or that provision be made, as in the Constitution of Connecticut, for the taxation of members by their churches for church purposes. Indeed, almost any course would be preferable to that suggested by the advocates of church taxation. The government certainly stands in as great need of religion and religious morals as it does of many other branches of education; and none will question the advisability of rendering governmental assistance to the promotion of literary and scientific achievement, even though it frequently result in vast expenditure of the public money, with no adequate recompense. And this, too, when it is well known that the arts and sciences nearly always bring financial gain to those who pursue them, while religion does not.

I would not go to the length of advocating the levy of a tax for church purposes by governmental authority, for it is meet that Church and State should ever maintain an inviolable separability; yet, to go to the opposite extreme of taxing church property for governmental purposes, would, it seems to me, be most unwise and indiscreet.

SPEED MOSBY.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED